

A Markov Chain Algorithm for Compression in Self-Organizing Particle Systems

Sarah Cannon^{1*} Joshua J. Daymude^{2†} Dana Randall^{1‡} Andrea Richa^{2§}

¹ College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0765

² Computing, Informatics, and Decision Systems Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281

Abstract

We consider programmable matter as a collection of simple computational elements (or *particles*) with limited (constant-size) memory that self-organize to solve system-wide problems of movement, configuration, and coordination. Here, we focus on the *compression* problem, in which the particle system gathers as tightly together as possible, as in a sphere or its equivalent in the presence of some underlying geometry. More specifically, we seek fully distributed, local, and asynchronous algorithms that lead the system to converge to a configuration with small perimeter. We present a Markov chain based algorithm that solves the compression problem under the *geometric amoebot model*, for particle systems that begin in a connected configuration with no holes. The algorithm takes as input a bias parameter λ , where $\lambda > 1$ corresponds to particles favoring inducing more lattice triangles within the particle system. We show that for all $\lambda > 2 + \sqrt{2}$, there is a constant $\alpha > 1$ such that at stationarity with all but exponentially small probability the particles are α -compressed, meaning the perimeter of the system configuration is at most $\alpha \cdot p_{min}$, where p_{min} is the minimum possible perimeter of the particle system. We additionally prove that the same algorithm can be used for *expansion* for small values of λ ; in particular, for all $0 < \lambda < 2.17$, there is a constant $\beta < 1$ such that at stationarity, with all but an exponentially small probability, the perimeter will be at least $\beta \cdot p_{max}$, where p_{max} is the maximum possible perimeter.

1 Introduction

Many programmable matter systems have recently been proposed and realized—modular and swarm robotics, synthetic biology, DNA tiling, and smart materials form an incomplete list—and each is often tailored toward a specific task or physical setting. In our work on self-organizing particle systems, we abstract away from specific settings and instead describe programmable matter as a collection of simple computational elements (to be referred to as *particles*) with limited computational power that each perform fully distributed, local, asynchronous algorithms to solve system-wide problems such as movement, configuration, and coordination. Here we present an algorithm for *compression*, in which the particle system gathers as tightly together as possible, as in a sphere or its equivalent in the presence of some underlying geometry. This phenomenon is

*sarah.cannon@gatech.edu. Supported in part by NSF DGE-1148903 and a grant from the Simons Foundation (#361047 to Sarah Cannon).

†jdaymude@asu.edu. Supported in part by an NSF undergraduate research award REU-026935.

‡randall@cc.gatech.edu. Supported in part by NSF CCF-1526900.

§aricha@asu.edu. Supported in part by the NSF under Awards CCF-1353089 and CCF-1422603.

often found in natural systems: fire ants form floating rafts by gathering in such a manner, and honey bees communicate foraging patterns within their hives. While each individual ant or bee cannot view the group as a whole when soliciting information, it can take cues from its immediate neighbors to achieve cooperation. It is with this motivation that we present a distributed algorithm for compression in the amoebot model derived from a Markov chain process.

In the (geometric) amoebot model, more formally defined in Section 2.1, particles with limited computational power move among the vertices of the triangular lattice Γ (Figure 1(a)) by traveling along the edges of Γ . The *compression problem* seeks to reorganize the configuration of a particle system (via movements of particles) such that the system converges to a configuration with small perimeter, where we measure the perimeter of a configuration by the length of the walk along its boundary. We say a particle system is α -compressed, for $\alpha > 1$, if the perimeter of the particle configuration is at most α times the minimum possible perimeter for those particles.

1.1 Our results and techniques

We present a *Markov chain* $\mathcal{M}$ for particle compression under the geometric amoebot model that can be directly translated into a *fully distributed, local, asynchronous compression algorithm* $\mathcal{A}$. Both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ take as input a *bias parameter* λ (where $\lambda > 1$ makes induced lattice triangles more favorable) and start from an arbitrary initial configuration for the particles that is connected and has no holes.

Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ is carefully designed according to the distributed and local nature of the system, so that the particles always stay connected and no holes form. Furthermore, we prove $\mathcal{M}$ is *reversible and ergodic*, meaning many of the standard tools of Markov chain analysis can be applied. While most of these proofs rely only on first principles, we emphasize they are far from trivial; working in a distributed setting necessitated carefully defined protocols for local moves that made proofs challenging.

When the particles execute the local moves of $\mathcal{M}$ (by running $\mathcal{A}$) for long enough, the configuration of the particles converges to the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$. We prove for all large enough λ there is a constant $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda) > 1$ such that at stationarity, with all but exponentially small probability, the particles are α -compressed, meaning the perimeter of the particle configuration is at most α times the minimum perimeter (which is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ for systems of n particles). We additionally show the counterintuitive result that $\lambda > 1$ is not enough to guarantee compression. In fact, for all $0 < \lambda < 2.17$, there is a constant $\beta < 1$ such that at stationarity with all but exponentially small probability the perimeter is at least a β fraction of the maximum perimeter, which is $\Theta(n)$ for systems of n particles. We call such a configuration β -expanded. This implies that for any $0 < \lambda < 2.17$, the probability that the particles are α -compressed is exponentially small for any constant α .

The motivation underlying the design of this Markov chain is from statistical physics, where ensembles of particles reminiscent of our amoebot model are used to study physical systems. Like a spring relaxing, systems tend to favor configurations that minimize energy. The energy function is determined by a *Hamiltonian* $H(\sigma)$; each configuration σ has weight $w(\sigma) = e^{-B \cdot H(\sigma)} / Z$, where where $B = 1/T$ is inverse temperature and $Z = \sum_{\tau} e^{-B \cdot H(\tau)}$ is the normalizing constant known as the *partition function*.

In our amoebot model, we assign each configuration σ a Hamiltonian $H(\sigma) = -t(\sigma)$, where $t(\sigma)$ is the number of triangles in σ , i.e., the number of faces of the triangle lattice Γ with all three vertices occupied by particles. Setting $\lambda = e^B$, we get $w(\sigma) = \lambda^{t(\sigma)}$. As λ gets larger (by increasing B , effectively lowering temperature), we favor configurations with a large number of occupied triangles, causing increasingly compressed configurations. Favoring edges with both endpoints occupied is

an alternative metric we could consider, but we prove for connected configurations on Γ without holes the two measures are equivalent. Likewise, favoring shorter perimeter is a third equivalent representation.

The key tool used to establish compression is a careful *Peierls argument*, used in statistical physics to study non-uniqueness of limiting Gibbs measures and to determine the presence of phase transitions (see, e.g., [10]), and in computer science to establish slow mixing of Markov chains (see, e.g., [3]). For standard Peierls arguments, configurations typically are not required to be connected and can have holes. Here, we focus on the connected and hole-free model to show compression can be achieved, even in an asynchronous distributed system where particles have constant-size memory and use only local information.

1.2 Related Work

Our algorithm is derived from a carefully designed Markov chain, enabling us to provide provable guarantees of its behavior. Random particle processes on the grid with hard constraints (e.g., *simple exclusion processes* where no two particles can occupy the same location) have been studied in statistical physics, but we want results under the further constraints of distributed computing. Our work exploits the memoryless, stochastic nature of Markov chains to accomplish particle compression in the amoebot model, just one of many distributed physical systems where compression-type problems have been studied.

When considering physical systems and models, one can differentiate between active and passive systems. Particles in passive systems have no explicit control over their movements, and in some cases do not have any computational power. One example is the DNA self-assembly work described in [22], where strands of DNA gather together to form larger structures with certain patterns.

In active systems, particles have control over their behavior and—depending on the model—can achieve some directed locomotion. *Swarm robotics* is one example; different variations of shape formation and collection problems have been studied (e.g. [13, 20]), but always with more computational power or global knowledge of the system. Similarly, pattern formation and creation of convex structures has been studied in the *cellular automata* domain (e.g. [5, 9]), but differs from our model by assuming more powerful computational capabilities. The *nubot* model [23] addresses a framework for biomolecular-inspired models which—although allowing some non-local movements—provides additional ways to create two dimensional shapes in polylogarithmic time.

Nature offers a variety of examples in which gathering and cooperative behavior is apparent. For example, social insects often exhibit compression-like characteristics in their collective behavior: fire ants form floating rafts [18], cockroach larvae perform self-organizing aggregation [15, 19], and honey bees choose hive locations based on a decentralized process of swarming and recruitment [4].

The rendezvous (or gathering) problem seeks to gather mobile agents together on some node of a graph (see, e.g., [1] and the references within). In comparison, our particles follow the exclusion principle, and hence would not be able to gather at a single node, and are computationally simpler than the mobile agents considered.

Lastly, in [6, 7], algorithms for hexagon shape formation in the amoebot model were presented. Although a hexagon satisfies a compressed configuration as we define here, the Markov chain-based algorithm we present takes a fully decentralized and local approach. This is naturally self-stabilizing, forgoing the need for a seed particle that may coordinate or initiate some underlying organization of the set of particles, as required in [6] and even more critically in [7].




Figure 1: (a) A section of the triangular lattice Γ ; (b) expanded particles (each denoted by its two occupied adjacent locations in Γ and a thick line in between) and contracted particles (occupying one location).

2 Background and Model

We begin with the geometric amoebot model for programmable matter. We then define some properties of particle systems and discuss what it means for a particle system to be compressed. We conclude with an overview of Markov chains, which form the basis for our algorithm for compression to be presented in Section 3.

2.1 The Amoebot Model

In the *amoebot model* [8], programmable matter consists of particles whose properties we now detail. An infinite undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ represents the set of relative locations that the particles can occupy (given by V) and the set of all possible atomic transitions between locations in V (given by E) [8]. We further assume the *geometric* variant of the amoebot model, which imposes an underlying geometric structure $G = \Gamma$, where Γ is the *triangular lattice* shown in Figure 1(a) (also called the infinite regular triangular grid graph, and denoted by G_{eqt} in earlier work).

Each particle occupies either a single location (i.e., it is *contracted*) or a pair of two adjacent locations on the graph (i.e., it is *expanded*); Figure 1(b) illustrates expanded and contracted particles on Γ . Each location can be occupied by at most one particle. Particles achieve movement via a series of *expansions* and *contractions*: a contracted particle may expand into an adjacent unoccupied location to become expanded, and completes its movement by contracting to once again occupy only one location.

Two particles occupying adjacent nodes are said to be connected by a bond (and hence induce an *edge* in the particle system), and we refer to them as *neighbors*. Particles are *anonymous*, but can uniquely identify each one of their (six) possible bonds and check which bonds lead to nodes occupied by neighboring particles. Additionally, the particles do not share any global orientation or coordinate system.

Every particle has a constant-size, shared, local memory which both it and its neighbors can read and write to for communication. Because of the limitation on memory size, particles can know neither the total size of the system nor an estimate of it. Particles execute a sequence of *atomic actions*, in each of which they do some local computation (in our case, this may involve checking which of its adjacent locations are occupied with particles) and an expansion or contraction. We assume a fully asynchronous system, where particles perform atomic actions concurrently and at different, possibly variable speeds; conflicts, which in our context arise when two particles attempt to expand into the same location, are resolved in an arbitrary manner. In order to analyze such systems, we use the standard asynchronous model from distributed computing, allowing us to evaluate the progress of the system through a sequential series of individual *particle activations*, where every time a particle is activated, it performs an atomic action.

2.2 Terminology for Particle Systems

First, we introduce notation and terminology that will be used throughout this paper. We call the collection of locations in Γ that are occupied by particles an *arrangement*; note two arrangements are the same even if particles occupy different locations within the arrangement. We can define an equivalence relation on arrangements, where two arrangements are equivalent if one is a translation of the other. We define a *configuration* to be an equivalence class of arrangements. If configuration σ is a rotation of configuration τ , we still consider σ and τ to be distinct configurations. That is, for the purpose of monitoring the particle system we maintain a global orientation of the particles, even though each individual particle has no sense of global orientation.

We will let capital letters refer to particles and lower case letters refer to locations on the triangular lattice Γ , e.g., “particle P at location ℓ .” For a particle P (respectively, location ℓ), we use $N(P)$ (respectively, $N(\ell)$) to denote the set of particles adjacent to P (respectively, to ℓ), where by *adjacent* we mean connected by a lattice edge. Similarly, for a particle P (respectively, location ℓ), we will use $n(P)$ (respectively, $n(\ell)$) to denote the six locations in the neighborhood of P (respectively, of ℓ). For locations ℓ and ℓ' , by $N(\ell \cup \ell')$ we mean $(N(\ell) \cup N(\ell')) \setminus \{\ell, \ell'\}$; the same holds for $n(\ell \cup \ell')$.

By an *edge* or *triangle* of a configuration σ we mean, respectively, an edge or face of Γ such that all (respectively, two or three) incident vertices are occupied by particles. The number of edges of σ is $e(\sigma)$ and the number of triangles is $t(\sigma)$. Throughout, by a *path* or a *cycle* we mean a path or cycle in the underlying graph Γ where all vertices are occupied by particles, and in the case of a cycle, at least one location inside the cycle is unoccupied. Two particles are *connected* if there exists a path between them, and a configuration is *connected* if all pairs of particles are. A *hole* in a configuration is a maximal finite component of adjacent unoccupied locations. We specifically consider connected configurations with no holes, and our algorithm, if starting at such a configuration, will maintain these properties.

2.3 Compression of Particle Systems

Our objective is to find a solution to the particle compression problem. There are many ways to formalize what it means for a particle system to be *compressed*. For example, one could try to minimize the diameter of the system, maximize the number of edges, or maximize the number of triangles. We choose to define compression in terms of minimizing the *perimeter*. We prove for connected configurations with no holes, minimizing perimeter, maximizing the number of edges, and maximizing the number of triangles are all equivalent and are stronger notions of compression than minimizing the diameter.

For a connected configuration σ of n particles with no holes, the *perimeter* of σ , denoted $p(\sigma)$, is the length of the walk around the (single external) boundary of the particles. In an abuse of notation, we use the term *perimeter* to refer both to the length $p(\sigma)$ of this walk and the walk itself. We assume any walk $\mathcal{W}$ along the perimeter of a configuration is in the clockwise direction. For a walk $\mathcal{W}$ in Γ with some notion of direction, we say location ℓ is *left* of edge $e = \overrightarrow{st} \in \mathcal{W}$ traversed from s to t if ℓ , s and t are the vertices of a triangular face of Γ with ℓ the next vertex counterclockwise around this face from t . With this terminology, every edge traversed in a clockwise walk $\mathcal{W}$ along the perimeter of σ has an unoccupied location to its left. Specifically, for any consecutive particles A, B, C in $\mathcal{W}$, the locations in the clockwise span of $n(B)$ from A to C are always unoccupied and there is at least one of them. Note an edge may appear twice in a perimeter walk $\mathcal{W}$; in this case, its length is counted twice in $p(\sigma)$. For a connected configuration of n particles without holes, the perimeter ranges from a maximum value of $2n - 2$ when the particles are in their

least compressed state (a tree with no induced triangles) to some minimum value $p_{\min}(n) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ when the particles are in their most compressed state. It is easy to see $p_{\min}(n) \leq 4\sqrt{n}$, and we now prove any configuration σ of n particles has $p(\sigma) \geq \sqrt{n}$; this bound is not tight but suffices for our proofs.

Lemma 2.1. *A connected configuration with $n \geq 2$ particles and no holes has perimeter at least $\sqrt{n}$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on n . A particle system with two particles necessarily has perimeter $2 \geq \sqrt{2}$, as claimed. Let σ be any particle configuration with n particles where $n > 2$, and suppose the lemma holds for all configurations with less than n particles.

First, suppose there is a particle $Q \in \sigma$ not incident to any triangles of σ . This implies Q has one, two, or three neighbors, none of which are adjacent. If Q has one neighbor, removing Q from σ yields a configuration σ' with $n - 1$ particles and, by induction, perimeter at least $\sqrt{n - 1}$. Thus

$$p(\sigma) = p(\sigma') + 2 \geq \sqrt{n - 1} + 2 \geq \sqrt{n}.$$

If Q has two neighbors, removing Q from σ produces two connected particle configurations σ_1 and σ_2 , where σ_1 has n_1 particles, σ_2 has n_2 particles, and $n_1 + n_2 = n - 1$. Thus

$$p(\sigma) \geq \sqrt{n_1} + \sqrt{n_2} + 4 > \sqrt{n - 1} + 4 > \sqrt{n}.$$

Similarly, if Q has three neighbors its removal produces three particle configurations with n_1 , n_2 , and n_3 particles, where $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = n - 1$, and we conclude

$$p(\sigma) \geq \sqrt{n_1} + \sqrt{n_2} + \sqrt{n_3} + 6 > \sqrt{n}.$$

Now, suppose every particle in σ is incident to some triangle of σ , implying there are at least $n/3$ triangles in σ . An equilateral triangle with side length 1 has area $\sqrt{3}/4$, so the perimeter of σ encloses an area of at least $A = \sqrt{3}n/12$. By the isoperimetric inequality, the minimum perimeter way of enclosing this area, without regard to lattice constraints, is with a circle of radius r and perimeter p , where

$$r = \sqrt{\frac{A}{\pi}} = \sqrt{\frac{n\sqrt{3}}{12\pi}}, \quad p = 2\pi r = \sqrt{\frac{\pi n}{\sqrt{3}}} > \sqrt{n}.$$

As the perimeter of σ also encloses an area of at least $\sqrt{3}n/12$, it is of length at least $\sqrt{n}$. $\square$

When n is clear from context we omit it and refer to $p_{\min} = p_{\min}(n)$ and $p_{\max} = p_{\max}(n)$. We now define what it means for a particle system to be compressed.

Definition 2.2. *For any $\alpha > 1$, a connected configuration σ with no holes is α -compressed if $p(\sigma) \leq \alpha \cdot p_{\min}$.*

We prove in Section 5 that our algorithm, when executed for a sufficiently long time, achieves α -compression with all but exponentially small probability for any constant $\alpha > 1$, provided n is sufficiently large. We note α -compression implies the diameter of the particle system is also $O(\sqrt{n})$, so our definition of α -compression is stronger than defining compression in terms of diameter.

In order to minimize perimeter using only simple local moves, we exploit the following relationship.

Lemma 2.3. *For a connected particle configuration σ with no holes, $t(\sigma) = 2n - p(\sigma) - 2$.*

Proof. We count particle-triangle incidences, of which there are $3t(\sigma)$. Counting another way, every particle has six incident triangles, except for those on the perimeter. Consider any traversal $\mathcal{W}$ of the perimeter; at each particle, the exterior angle is 120, 180, 240, 300, or 360 degrees. These correspond to the particle “missing” 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of its possible six incident triangles, or $\text{degree}/60$ missing triangles. If $\mathcal{W}$ visits the same particle multiple times, count the appropriate exterior angle at each visit. The sum of exterior angles along $\mathcal{W}$ is $180p(\sigma) + 360$, so in total particles on the perimeter are missing $3p(\sigma) + 6$ triangles. This implies there are $6n - 3p(\sigma) - 6$ particle-triangle incidences, so $3t(\sigma) = 6n - 3p(\sigma) - 6$. $\square$

Minimizing perimeter is also equivalent to maximizing edges.

Lemma 2.4. *For a connected particle configuration σ with no holes, $e(\sigma) = 3n - p(\sigma) - 3$.*

Proof. The proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 2.3, counting particle-edge incidences instead, of which there are $2e(\sigma)$. Counting another way, every particle has six incident edges, except for those on the perimeter. Consider any traversal $\mathcal{W}$ of the perimeter; at each particle, the exterior angle is 120, 180, 240, 300, or 360 degrees. These correspond to the particle “missing” 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 of its possible six incident edges, or $\text{degree}/60 - 1$ missing edges. If $\mathcal{W}$ visits the same particle multiple times, count the appropriate exterior angle at each visit. The sum of exterior angles along $\mathcal{W}$ is $180p(\sigma) + 360$, so in total particles on the perimeter are missing $3p(\sigma) + 6 - p(\sigma)$ edges. This implies there are $6n - 2p(\sigma) - 6$ particle-edges incidences, so $2e(\sigma) = 6n - 2p(\sigma) - 6$. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *For a connected particle configuration σ with no holes, $t(\sigma) = e(\sigma) - (n - 1)$.*

Corollary 2.6. *A connected particle configuration σ with no holes and minimum perimeter is also a configuration with the maximum number of triangles (and edges).*

2.4 Markov chains

The distributed protocol for particle compression we present is based on a Markov chain, i.e., a memoryless stochastic process defined on a finite set of states Ω . The transition matrix P on $\Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined so that $P(x, y)$ is the probability of moving from state x to state y in one step, for any pair $x, y \in \Omega$. The t -step transition probability $P^t(x, y)$ is the probability of moving from x to y in exactly t steps.

A Markov chain is *ergodic* if it is *irreducible*, i.e., for all $x, y \in \Omega$, there is a t such that $P^t(x, y) > 0$, and *aperiodic*, i.e., for all $x, y \in \Omega$, $\text{g.c.d.}\{t : P^t(x, y) > 0\} = 1$. Any finite, ergodic Markov chain converges to a unique distribution π , i.e., for all $x, y \in \Omega$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P^t(x, y) = \pi(y)$. In fact, for any distribution π' such that $\pi'(x)P(x, y) = \pi'(y)P(y, x)$ (the *detailed balance condition*) and $\sum_{x \in \Omega} \pi'(x) = 1$, π' is the unique stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$ (see, e.g., [12]).

Given a desired stationary distribution π on Ω , the celebrated Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [14] defines appropriate transition probabilities. Starting at state x , pick a neighbor y in Ω uniformly with probability $1/(2\Delta)$, where Δ is the maximum number of neighbors of any state, and move to y with probability $\min(1, \pi(y)/\pi(x))$; with the remaining probability stay at x and repeat. Using detailed balance, one can verify if the state space is connected then π must be the stationary distribution. While calculating $\pi(x)/\pi(y)$ seems to require global knowledge, this ratio can often be calculated using only local information when many terms cancel out. In our case, the Metropolis probabilities are simply $\min(1, \lambda^{|t(y)-t(x)|})$; this difference is just the change in the number of triangles incident to the moving particle, which can be calculated with only local information.

3 Algorithms for Compression

Our objective is to demonstrate how stochastic algorithms can provably achieve compression, focusing on self-organizing particle systems on the triangular lattice Γ . Our algorithm is based on Markov chain principles that will enable us to prove rigorous results about the algorithm's behavior. Remarkably, it does not even require the particles to communicate more than one bit of information to each other, even though the amoebot model allows for such exchanges; at any activation, a particle only needs to know which of its neighboring locations are occupied and if any of those neighbors are expanded.

Our algorithm carefully maintains several critical properties throughout its execution. First, the particle system stays connected and no holes form, even while particles decide where to move based only on local information. Additionally, any moves made are reversible: if a particle moves to a new location, there is a nonzero probability that during the next step, it moves back to its previous location. Finally, the moves allowed by the algorithm (and respective Markov chain) suffice to transform any configuration of particles into any other configuration. These conditions are essential so certain tools from Markov chain analysis can be applied.

In addition to the precise conditions needed to ensure connectivity and reversibility, our algorithm achieves compression by making particles more likely to move into a position where they form more triangles with their neighbors. Specifically, a bias parameter λ controls how strongly the particles favor being incident to triangles; $\lambda > 1$ corresponds to favoring triangles, while $\lambda < 1$ corresponds to disfavoring triangles. As Lemma 2.3 shows, locally favoring more triangles is equivalent to globally favoring a shorter perimeter; this is the relationship we exploit to obtain particle compression.

3.1 The Local Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$

We start with two key properties that enable a particle to move from location ℓ to location ℓ' . If ℓ and ℓ' are neighboring locations on Γ , let $\mathbb{S} = N(\ell) \cap N(\ell')$ be the set of particles adjacent to both ℓ and ℓ' (i.e., $|\mathbb{S}| = 0, 1$, or 2).

Property 1. $|\mathbb{S}| = 1$ or 2 and every particle in $N(\ell \cup \ell')$ is connected to a particle in $\mathbb{S}$ by a path through $N(\ell \cup \ell')$.

Property 2. $|\mathbb{S}| = 0$; ℓ and ℓ' each have at least one neighbor; all particles in $N(\ell) \setminus \{\ell'\}$ are connected by paths within this set; and all particles in $N(\ell') \setminus \{\ell\}$ are connected by paths within this set.

These properties capture precisely the structure required to maintain particle connectivity and prevent holes from forming. Additionally, both are symmetric for ℓ and ℓ' , necessary for reversibility. However, they are not so restrictive as to limit the movement of particles and prevent compression from occurring; we will see moves satisfying these properties suffice to transform any configuration into any other.

We now present the local asynchronous algorithm that each particle runs. Later we show how to view this algorithm through the lens of our Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$. Both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ take as an input a bias parameter $\lambda > 1$, and begin in an arbitrary starting configuration σ_0 of contracted particles that is connected and has no holes.

Each particle P continuously runs Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, executing Steps 1–7 if P is contracted, and Steps 8–11 if P is expanded. Note a constant number of random bits suffice to generate q , as only a constant precision is required (given that $t' - t$ is an integer in $[-6, 6]$ and λ is a constant). In Step 9, Condition (1) ensures no holes form; Condition (2) ensures the particles stay connected

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$: Algorithm for compression run by particle P

If P is contracted:

- 1: Let ℓ denote P 's current location.
- 2: Particle P chooses neighboring location ℓ' uniformly at random from the six possible choices, and generates a random number $q \in (0, 1)$.
- 3: **if** ℓ' is unoccupied and P has no expanded neighboring particle at ℓ **then**
- 4: P expands to simultaneously occupy ℓ and ℓ' .
- 5: **if** there are no expanded particles adj. to ℓ or ℓ' **then**
- 6: P sets $flag = TRUE$ in its local memory
- 7: **else** P sets $flag = FALSE$.

If P is expanded:

- 8: Let t be the number of triangles formed by P when it was contracted at its original location ℓ , and let t' be the number of triangles formed by P if it contracts at the location it expanded into, ℓ' .
 - 9: **if** (1) location ℓ does not have five neighboring particles, (2) locations ℓ and ℓ' satisfy Property 1 or Property 2, (3) $q < \lambda^{t'-t}$, and (4) $flag = TRUE$ **then**
 - 10: P contracts to ℓ' .
 - 11: **else** P contracts back to ℓ .
-

and the corresponding Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ is reversible; Condition (3) ensures the moves happen with probabilities such that $\mathcal{M}$ converges to the desired distribution; and Condition (4) ensures P is the only particle in its neighborhood potentially moving to a new position, ℓ' , since P last expanded. The claims regarding Conditions (1)–(3) pertain to the underlying Markov process and will be formalized in the next subsections. To understand why Condition (4) suffices to ensure P is the only particle (potentially) moving to a new location in its immediate neighborhood, note that once P expands, any other particle P' expanding into a position adjacent to P will contract back to its original position during its next execution, since P' will set its own flag to FALSE in Step 7. We assume any conflicts arising from two particles attempting to concurrently move into the same location are resolved arbitrarily. Hence, any concurrent movements will cover pairwise disjoint neighborhoods and the respective actions will be mutually independent.

Following the classical asynchronous model [17], for any starting configuration σ_0 , we have that for any concurrent execution of $\mathcal{A}$ that reaches a configuration σ , there is a sequential execution of the same atomic actions that also reaches σ , for all σ .

3.2 The Markov Chain $\mathcal{M}$

We now make explicit the Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$. The state space of $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all connected configurations of n contracted particles with no holes. Transitions between states happen subject to the rules and probabilities we now present.

Beginning at any connected, hole-free configuration σ_0 of contracted particles, repeat:

1. Select particle P uniformly at random from among all particles; let ℓ be its location. Choose, uniformly at random, $\ell' \in n(\ell)$ and $q \in (0, 1)$.
2. **If** ℓ' is unoccupied **then** P expands to simultaneously occupy ℓ and ℓ' ; **Else** return to Step 1.
3. Let t be the number of triangles formed by P in position ℓ , and let t' be the number of triangles formed by P in position ℓ' .

4. **If** (1) location ℓ does not have five neighboring particles, (2) locations ℓ and ℓ' satisfy Property 1 or Property 2, and (3) $q < \lambda^{t'-t}$ **then** contract P to ℓ' .
5. **Else** contract P back to ℓ .

In $\mathcal{M}$, we have paired up the consecutive actions that a particle will take according to Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ when contracted and then expanded into one state transition, so that a transition corresponds to the complete movement of exactly one (contracted) particle into a new (adjacent) location. Let P be a particle that eventually moves from location ℓ to ℓ' at some time t' according to an execution of $\mathcal{A}$. Condition (4) in Step 9 and the condition in Step 3 of $\mathcal{A}$ ensure that if P was activated and expanded at time t before being activated once again and contracting to occupy ℓ' at time $t' > t$, even if other particles are activated between t and t' no movement to a new location will occur in the neighborhood of P in that time interval. Hence all activations of other particles in the neighborhood of P in the interval (t, t') can be ignored, justifying the pairing of actions in the Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$. Note we assume a particle can tell the difference between an expanded particle's *tail* and *head*, that is, the location the particle previously occupied and the location that particle has recently expanded into. When deciding which location to contract to, a particle whose flag is set to true can ignore the heads of any adjacent expanded particles, knowing that those particles necessarily have their flags set to false and will soon contract back to their original locations.

For every sequential execution of atomic actions that leads to configuration σ' in $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a sequence of transitions in $\mathcal{M}$ that reaches a configuration σ such that σ can be obtained from σ' by preserving the locations of all contracted particles in σ' and by letting every expanded particle in σ' contract according to the rules of $\mathcal{A}$, for all corresponding pairs (σ', σ) . Conversely, every sequence of transitions in $\mathcal{M}$ that reaches a configuration σ directly corresponds to a sequence of atomic actions in $\mathcal{A}$ also leading to $\sigma' = \sigma$. The perimeter of the respective σ' and σ differs by at most a constant factor, and hence proving α -compression for σ also implies α' -compression for σ' , and vice-versa, for constants α and α' . Hence, we can use $\mathcal{M}$, and respective Markov chain tools and techniques, in order to analyze the correctness of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$.

We note that, under the assumptions of the asynchronous model of distributed computing, one cannot typically assume the next particle to be activated is equally likely to be any particle, as we assume in Step 1 of the description of $\mathcal{M}$. We make this assumption in order to be able to explicitly calculate the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$ so that we can provide rigorous guarantees about its structure, but do not expect the behavior of the system would be substantially different if this requirement was relaxed.

To justify this random activation assumption, we note that random sequences of particle activations can be approximated using Poisson clocks with mean 1.¹ That is, each particle activates, and executes Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, at a random real time drawn from the exponential distribution e^{-t} . After each action, the particle then computes another random time drawn from the same distribution e^{-t} and executes again after that amount of time has elapsed. The exponential distribution is unique in that, if particle P has just activated, it is equally likely that any particle will be the next particle to activate, including particle P (see, e.g., [12]). Moreover, the particles update without requiring knowledge of any of the other particles' clocks. Similar Poisson clocks are commonly used to describe physical systems that perform updates in parallel in continuous time.

¹The analysis can be modified to accommodate each clock having its own constant mean; however, for the sake of ease of presentation, we assume here that they are all i.i.d.

3.3 Invariants for Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$

We begin by showing $\mathcal{M}$ maintains certain invariants. We prove Conditions (1) and (2) in Step 4 of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ ensure the particles remain in a connected configuration with no holes, provided they start in such a configuration.

Lemma 3.1. *If the particles are initially connected, during the execution of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ they remain connected.*

Proof. Consider one iteration of $\mathcal{M}$ where a particle P moves from location ℓ to location ℓ' . Let σ be the configuration before this move, and σ' the configuration after. We show if σ is connected, then so is σ' .

A move of particle P from ℓ to ℓ' occurs only if ℓ and ℓ' are adjacent and satisfy Property 1 or Property 2. First, suppose they satisfy Property 1. Let $P_1, P_2 \neq P$ be particles, and let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a path connecting them in σ . If $P \notin \mathcal{Q}$, then P_1 and P_2 remain connected by $\mathcal{Q}$ in σ' . If $P \in \mathcal{Q}$, let N_1 and N_2 be the two particles on path $\mathcal{Q}$ before and after P , respectively. By Property 1, there exist paths in $N(\ell \cup \ell')$ from N_1 to a particle $S_1 \in \mathbb{S}$ and from N_2 to a particle $S_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, possibly with $S_1 = S_2$. A (not necessarily simple) path from P_1 to P_2 in σ' is the union of $\mathcal{Q}$ from P_1 to N_1 ; the path from N_1 to S_1 in $N(\ell \cup \ell')$; if $S_1 \neq S_2$, the path from S_1 to P at location ℓ' to S_2 ; the path from S_2 to N_2 in $N(\ell \cup \ell')$; and $\mathcal{Q}$ from N_2 to P_2 . As P is connected to $S_1 \in \mathbb{S}$ and by the above argument S_1 is connected to all other particles, we conclude P is connected to every other particle and thus σ' is connected.

Next, assume locations ℓ and ℓ' satisfy Property 2. Let $P_1, P_2 \neq P$ be particles; we show they are connected by a path not containing P . Path $\mathcal{Q}$ connecting P_1 and P_2 in σ exists, and suppose it contains P . Let N_1 and N_2 be the vertices on $\mathcal{Q}$ before and after P , respectively. Both N_1 and N_2 are neighbors of ℓ , and by Property 2 all neighbors of ℓ are connected by a path in $N(\ell)$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}$ can be augmented to form a (not necessarily simple) walk $\mathcal{Q}'$ by replacing P with a path from N_1 to N_2 in $N(\ell)$. As $P \notin \mathcal{Q}'$, this walk also connects P_1 and P_2 in σ' . Additionally, because ℓ' has at least one neighbor by Property 2, P remains connected to all other particles in σ' and thus σ' is connected. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *If the particles begin in a connected configuration with no holes, during the execution of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ they will never form a configuration with a hole.*

Proof. Recall we assume a cycle in σ encircles at least one unoccupied location; note a configuration has a hole if and only if it has a cycle encircling that hole. Let σ be a particle configuration with particle P at location ℓ , and σ' the same configuration with P at neighboring location ℓ' . We assume σ has no cycles (i.e., no holes) and prove σ' has no cycles (i.e., no holes).

We first show if a cycle is introduced in σ' , then P must be on that cycle. Suppose this is not the case and σ' has a cycle $\mathcal{C}$ with $P \notin \mathcal{C}$. If P is removed from location ℓ' , $\mathcal{C}$ still exists. If P is then placed at ℓ , yielding σ , then $\mathcal{C}$ still exists unless it had enclosed exactly one unoccupied location, ℓ . However, this is not possible as any cycle in $\sigma' \setminus P$ encircling ℓ would also necessarily encircle neighboring unoccupied location ℓ' . This implies $\mathcal{C}$ is present in σ , a contradiction, so we conclude any cycle in σ' must contain P .

By the conditions in Step 4 of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ that must be met before a move occurs, particle P necessarily has fewer than five neighbors in σ and locations ℓ and ℓ' satisfy Property 1 or Property 2. First, suppose they satisfy Property 2. While P might momentarily create a cycle when it expands to occupy both locations ℓ and ℓ' , it will then contract to location ℓ' . Suppose P is part of some cycle $\mathcal{C}$ in σ' . Before and after P on $\mathcal{C}$ are some neighbors N_1 and N_2 of P . By Property 2, N_1 and N_2 are connected by a path in $N(\ell')$, which doesn't contain P . Replacing path




Figure 2: A particle configuration for which all valid moves of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ satisfy Property 2; no particle has a valid move satisfying Property 1. This demonstrates the subtlety of the Markov chain rules we have defined.

$N_1 - P - N_2$ in cycle $\mathcal{C}$ by this path in $N(\ell')$ yields a (not necessarily simple) cycle $\mathcal{C}'$ in σ' not containing P , a contradiction.

Suppose ℓ and ℓ' satisfy Property 1; recall location ℓ has less than five neighbors in σ . Suppose there exists a cycle $\mathcal{C}$ in σ' , which by definition encircles at least one unoccupied location. If ℓ is unoccupied inside $\mathcal{C}$, then so is at least one of its neighbors; we conclude $\mathcal{C}$ encircles some unoccupied location $\ell'' \neq \ell$. Let N_1 and N_2 be the particles on cycle $\mathcal{C}$ before and after P . If there exists a path between N_1 and N_2 in $N(\ell')$, the argument in the previous paragraph applies, so we suppose this is not the case. It must be, without loss of generality, that $|\mathbb{S}| = 2$ and there exist paths in $N(\ell \cup \ell')$ from N_1 to $S_1 \in \mathbb{S}$ and from N_2 to $S_2 \in \mathbb{S}$, with $S_1 \neq S_2$. There then exists cycle $\mathcal{C}'$ in σ , obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by replacing path $N_1 - P - N_2$, where P is in location ℓ' , with the path $N_1 - \dots - S_1 - P - S_2 - \dots - N_2$, where P is in location ℓ . This is a valid (not necessarily simple) cycle in σ , as it still encircles unoccupied location $\ell'' \neq \ell$. This is also a contradiction, so in all cases we find σ' has no cycles. $\square$

3.4 Ergodicity of Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$

We next show the carefully-defined moves of $\mathcal{M}$ suffice to move from any configuration σ to any other configuration τ , necessary for showing $\mathcal{M}$ is ergodic and thus has a unique stationary distribution. We emphasize the details of this proof are far from trivial, and occupy the next ten pages. Figure 2 illustrates one difficulty. It depicts a particle configuration for which there exist no valid moves satisfying Property 1; the only valid moves satisfy Property 2. Thus if moves satisfying Property 2 are not included, the state space of $\mathcal{M}$ is not connected.

Our approach relies critically on moves satisfying Property 2. At a high level, we prove for any configuration σ there exists a sequence of valid particle moves transforming σ into a straight line, and then prove $\mathcal{M}$ is reversible, implying for any other configuration τ there exists a sequence of valid particle moves transforming that straight line into τ .

Given a particle configuration σ with lowest leftmost particle S , we find a sequence of valid particle moves transforming σ into a line of particles stretching down and left from S ; after one potential move in a initialization step, particle S never moves. We traverse the perimeter of σ , starting at S , finding particles which can be *eliminated*, or moved to this line stretching away from S . We begin with some crucial definitions and subsequently examine the neighborhood of S , where our iterative process will begin.




Figure 3: Particle positions from the proofs of (a) Lemma 3.5 and (b) Lemma 3.6, where S is the lowest leftmost particle of σ and T is its first neighbor. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

Definition 3.3. An unoccupied location ℓ in the triangle lattice is a gap of configuration σ if placing an additional particle P at ℓ results in a hole in configuration $\sigma \cup P$.

Definition 3.4. Let S be the lowest leftmost particle of σ . Its first neighbor T is the first particle encountered in a clockwise traversal of $n(S)$ beginning at the location directly above S .

Specifically, S 's first neighbor T is the particle directly above S , if such a particle is present; otherwise, T is the particle above and right of S , if such a particle is present; if not, there must be a particle below and right of S , and we call this particle T . Particle T will serve as the second vertex of our walk $\mathcal{W}$ around the perimeter of σ as we look for particles to eliminate; given S and T , $\mathcal{W}$ will be unique. We begin with an initialization lemma that will set up the base case of this iterative process.

Lemma 3.5. Let S be the lowest leftmost particle of σ . If its first neighbor T is below and right of S , there exists a valid move for S after which T is above and right of S .

Proof. As S is the lowest leftmost particle of σ , there are no particles in the column left of S or in the same column as S below S . This also implies T is the only particle in $N(S)$; see Figure 3(a). It follows that particle S moving down one unit is a valid move satisfying Property 1, regardless of whether there is a particle below T or not. After this move, T is still S 's first neighbor, and now T is above and right of S . $\square$

Lemma 3.6. Let σ be a connected configuration with no holes and lowest leftmost particle S which has first neighbor T above and right of S . Let ℓ be the location above S , and suppose ℓ is a gap. There exists a sequence of particle moves, where S and T do not move, after which ℓ is not a gap.

Proof. Location ℓ is only a gap if the location two units above S is occupied by some particle Q and the location above T is unoccupied; see Figure 3(b). Particle Q has at most two neighbors, and those neighbors must be connected. Particle Q moving to ℓ is valid because Property 2 is satisfied. There then exists two more valid moves for particle Q yielding configuration σ' with Q below and left of S , where ℓ is not a gap in σ' . $\square$

Thus, we may assume S has its first neighbor T above S or above and right of S , and there are no gaps in the clockwise span of $n(S)$ from the location below and left of S to T . This will be an important base case in the induction to follow.

We now begin to define the walk $\mathcal{W}$ around the perimeter of σ that will be the focus of our inductive arguments. Let S be the lowest leftmost particle of σ . After a potential initialization step described in Lemma 3.5, particle S will not move, so we refer to it as the *anchor* of particle configuration σ and also as the *anchor* of all intermediate particle configurations. That is, if we say ‘configuration σ with anchor S ,’ either σ is the configuration we have started with and S is its lowest leftmost particle or σ is an intermediate configuration and S was the lowest leftmost particle in the initial configuration. We maintain that the only particles below and left of S stretch down and left from S in a straight line.

A *clockwise walk* $\mathcal{W}$ around the perimeter of σ starting at S satisfies the property that for any particle C (‘current’) that is after particle P (‘previous’) and before particle N (‘next’) in $\mathcal{W}$, there are no particles in the locations traversed in a clockwise span of $n(C)$ from P to N . We assume all walks start at S and have its first neighbor T as their second particle; given this, $\mathcal{W}$ is unique. However, the ‘previous’ or ‘next’ particle of $\mathcal{W}$ is not well-defined at the start or end of $\mathcal{W}$, respectively. We will still refer to ‘the particle P before S in the walk’, but we will mean the location below and left of S , whether or not there is a particle there. If the walk ends at some particle U before traversing the whole perimeter, by ‘the particle N after U in the walk’, we mean the next particle along the perimeter of σ . If the walk traverses the entire perimeter of σ and ends again at particle S , by ‘the particle N after S in the walk’, we mean the location below and left of S , whether or not there is a particle there. This will ensure we can use uniform language when discussing the unoccupied locations in the clockwise span of $N(C)$ from a previous particle P to a next particle N , even when C is at the start or end of $\mathcal{W}$.

Our plan is to iteratively move all particles along the perimeter of σ to a location adjacent to particle S , and subsequently into a straight line stretching down and left from S . We say a particle P is *eliminated* once it has moved to join this line. However, there may be obstacles to immediately eliminating a particle P . We say a gap g is *adjacent to a walk* $\mathcal{W}$ if there exists consecutive particles P , C , and N in $\mathcal{W}$ such that g is in the clockwise traversal from P to N of $n(C)$. Specifically, we consider a gap to be adjacent to a walk $\mathcal{W}$ if it is immediately left of an edge in $\mathcal{W}$. It is possible to eliminate a particle P by moving it along the perimeter from its current position to S precisely when there are no gaps adjacent to, i.e. on the left side of, the perimeter of σ from S to P . We now formalize this.

Lemma 3.7. *Let σ be a connected configuration with no holes. Let V be any particle in σ with at most four neighbors that are connected within $n(V)$. Let U be the farthest clockwise of V ’s connected neighbors. Let ℓ' be the (necessarily unoccupied) location in $n(V)$ one unit clockwise from U , and suppose ℓ' is not a gap. Then particle V moving to location ℓ' is a valid move satisfying Property 1.*

Proof. As we assume V has fewer than five neighbors, it only remains to show V ’s location ℓ and location ℓ' satisfy Property 1. First, we note $\mathbb{S} = N(\ell) \cap N(\ell') = \{U\}$. This is because particle U is adjacent to both ℓ and ℓ' , and as P ’s neighbors are connected and number at most four, it is not possible for the other location ℓ_1 in $n(\ell) \cap n(\ell')$ to also be occupied.

Every particle in $N(\ell)$ is connected to U by assumption. It only remains to show every particle in $N(\ell') \setminus V$ is connected to U by a path in this set. Suppose this is not the case and there exists $F \in N(\ell') \setminus V$ not connected to U by a path in this set; see Figure 4(a) for an example. There must be some unoccupied location ℓ_2 in the clockwise span of $n(\ell')$ from U to F . As σ is connected, there exists some path $\mathcal{P}$ connecting F to U . Placing an additional particle Q at location ℓ' then creates a cycle in σ , going from U to Q to F and then following $\mathcal{P}$ back to U , that encircles either unoccupied location ℓ_1 or unoccupied location ℓ_2 . We conclude ℓ' is a gap, a contradiction. Thus ℓ and ℓ' must satisfy Property 1, so V moving from ℓ to ℓ' is valid as claimed. $\square$




Figure 4: Images from the proofs of (a) Lemma 3.7 and (b,c) Lemma 3.8. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

Lemma 3.8. *Let σ be a connected particle configuration with no holes and anchor S . Consider the clockwise walk $\mathcal{W}$ along the perimeter from S to some particle U , and suppose there aren't any gaps adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. Let V be the next particle after U on the perimeter of σ , and suppose V 's neighbors are connected and number at most four. Then there exists a valid sequence of moves for particle V that eliminates it, moving it below and left of S .*

Proof. We use induction on the length of walk $\mathcal{W}$. First, suppose $|\mathcal{W}| = 0$, i.e., $U = S$, and there are no gaps adjacent to this length 0 walk in the clockwise span of $n(S)$ from S 's lower left neighbor to V ; see Figure 4(b) for an example. As $N(V)$ is connected, by Lemma 3.7 particle V moving from its current location one unit counterclockwise around S is a valid move. After this move, $N(V)$ remains locally connected, and in fact $N(V) = S$ so $|N(V)| = 1 < 5$. We repeat the same argument until V is above and left of S , at which point there is a sequence of valid moves for V that eliminates it.

Now, let U be at distance $k > 0$ from S , and suppose the statement holds for all walks of length less than k . Let ℓ' be the location in $n(V)$ clockwise from U . Because ℓ' is adjacent to U , it is not a gap; see Figure 4(c). Because $N(V)$ is connected and of size at most four, by Lemma 3.7 particle V moving to location ℓ' is valid. If V at location ℓ' is still not adjacent to the particle U' that is before U in $\mathcal{W}$, as is the case in Figure 4(c), repeat: necessarily, V at location ℓ' has exactly one neighbor, U , and as none of U 's neighbors are gaps we apply Lemma 3.7 until V is adjacent to U' . At this point, the walk $\mathcal{W}'$ from S along the perimeter of σ to particle U'' before V on the perimeter (possibly $U'' = U'$) is strictly shorter than $\mathcal{W}$ and still not adjacent to any gaps. Particle V must have at most four neighbors in its new location, otherwise that new location was a hole before V occupied it, impossible by Lemma 3.2. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a sequence of valid moves for V that eliminates it. $\square$

Ideally, there would be no gaps adjacent to the perimeter of σ ; then, all particles could be eliminated. As gaps are problematic, our procedure will iteratively walk around the perimeter of σ , eliminating particles to remove gaps when it encounters them. In order to be able to remove gaps when we reach them, additionally we ensure $\mathcal{W}$, the shortest perimeter walk beginning at S adjacent to a gap, will not visit any particle more than once. If a particle P is revisited by $\mathcal{W}$, it is possible to eliminate a particle between the two occurrences of P on $\mathcal{W}$, as we illustrate in the next lemma. This can then be repeated to eliminate all particles between the two occurrences of P on $\mathcal{W}$, resulting in P only appearing once on $\mathcal{W}$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let σ be a connected particle configuration with no holes and anchor S . Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the shortest perimeter walk starting at S to which a gap is adjacent, and suppose $\mathcal{W}$ visits some*

particle P twice. Then there exists a particle in $\mathcal{W}$ between the two occurrences of P that can be eliminated.

Proof. First, suppose there is no particle that appears in $\mathcal{W}$ two or more times between the two occurrences of P . Let F be any particle on $\mathcal{W}$ between the two occurrences of P with at most four neighbors; such a particle must exist as all particles in $\mathcal{W}$ have at most five neighbors, and it is not realizable for every particle on $\mathcal{W}$ between the two occurrences of P to have exactly five neighbors. Suppose F 's neighbors are not connected. There then must be unoccupied locations on both sides of walk $\mathcal{W}$ as it passes through F , which it does exactly once. However, this then implies the cycle formed by the particles of $\mathcal{W}$ from the first occurrence of P in $\mathcal{W}$ to the second occurrence of P in $\mathcal{W}$ encircles an unoccupied location, a contradiction as we assumed σ had no holes. We conclude F 's neighbors are connected. Because F 's neighbors number at most four and are connected, we apply Lemma 3.8 to eliminate F as claimed.

Suppose there is a particle that appears two or more times on $\mathcal{W}$ between the two occurrences of P in $\mathcal{W}$. By recursion, we can find some such particle P' , appearing twice on $\mathcal{W}$ between the two occurrences of P , where no other particle appears twice between both occurrences of P' in $\mathcal{W}$. We then repeat the above argument for P' ; the particle between the first two occurrences of P' that can be eliminated is also between the first two occurrences of P in $\mathcal{W}$, satisfying the conclusion of the lemma. $\square$

We now prove an additional lemma about moving particles while not introducing gaps. In particular, we focus on $\mathcal{W}$, the shortest perimeter walk starting at S to which a gap is adjacent. The only gap(s) adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$, i.e. to the left of $\mathcal{W}$, are necessarily adjacent to its last particle.

Lemma 3.10. *Let σ be a connected configuration with no holes and anchor S . Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the shortest perimeter walk starting at S to which a gap is adjacent. Let Q be a particle with exactly two neighbors N_1 and N_2 both adjacent to some location $\ell \in n(Q)$, where $\mathcal{W}$ ends on the same side of the line through N_1 and N_2 as Q (possibly $Q \in \mathcal{W}$, possibly $Q \notin \mathcal{W}$). There exists a sequence of valid moves after which Q is at ℓ or some other particle is at ℓ , where in either case no additional gaps are created adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. We assume without loss of generality Q 's neighborhood consists of, consecutively in clockwise order, N_2 , ℓ , N_1 , and three unoccupied locations. Let ζ be the line spanning N_1 and N_2 . We will induct on the number of particles on the opposite side of ζ from particle Q .

First, suppose there are no particles on the opposite side of ζ from Q . Then particle Q moving to location ℓ is a valid move satisfying Property 1, as all neighbors of $n(Q) \cup \ell$ are in the set $\mathbb{S} = N(Q) \cap N(\ell) = \{N_1, N_2\}$. Furthermore, no additional gaps have been created and thus there are no new gaps adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$.

We now suppose there are $k \geq 1$ particles on the opposite side of ζ from Q , and assume the conclusions of the lemma hold for all $k' < k$. We split the analysis into two cases, depending on whether location ℓ is a gap or not.

Case 1: Location ℓ is a gap: The location on the opposite side of ℓ from Q must be occupied by some particle Q' , and the two locations in $n(\ell) \cap n(Q')$ must be unoccupied; see Figure 5(a). The clockwise perimeter walk from N_2 to Q to N_1 , which has ℓ on its left, cannot be in $\mathcal{W}$ as it is adjacent to the gap at location ℓ . Similarly, the clockwise perimeter walk through Q' with ℓ to its left is not contained in $\mathcal{W}$.

If $N(Q')$ is not connected, we apply the induction hypothesis. Particle Q' necessarily has two neighbors Q_1 and Q_2 both adjacent to a common location ℓ' ; see Figure 5(b). The line ζ' spanning Q_1 and Q_2 is parallel to line ζ , so $\mathcal{W}$ ends on the same side of ζ' as Q' and there are strictly




Figure 5: Particle positions from the proof of Lemma 3.10, Case 1. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

fewer than k particles on the opposite side of ζ' from Q' . We conclude by induction there exists a sequence of moves such that either Q' moves to location ℓ' or another particle moves to location ℓ' . In both cases, no gaps are introduced adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. In the first case, ℓ is no longer a gap and we proceed to Case 2, below. In the second case, $N(Q')$ has become connected, the situation we consider next.

If $N(Q')$ is connected, Q' moving to location ℓ is a valid move satisfying Property 2; see Figure 5(c). This move creates a new gap at the location Q' used to occupy. However, this gap is only adjacent to and left of perimeter walks not in $\mathcal{W}$. We conclude a particle has moved to location ℓ without creating any additional gaps adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$, as desired.

Case 2: Location ℓ is not a gap: As location ℓ is not a gap, particle Q moving to location ℓ is a valid move that we assume occurs. If this move did not create an additional gap adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$ we are done, so suppose such a gap is created. See Figure 6(a); we label the three other neighbors of location ℓ as ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , and ℓ_3 in counterclockwise order, where ℓ_1 is adjacent to N_1 and ℓ_3 is adjacent to N_2 . If Q created a gap adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$ when it moved to location ℓ , this gap must be at ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , or ℓ_3 . A gap at one of these locations necessitates another particle on the other side of the gap from location ℓ . There are five such potential locations: a , adjacent to ℓ_1 ; b , adjacent to ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 ; c , adjacent to ℓ_2 ; d , adjacent to ℓ_2 and ℓ_3 ; and e , adjacent to ℓ_3 .

First, suppose a gap was created at ℓ_1 ; this means there must be a particle present at location a or b . But then because there was already a particle at location N_1 , ℓ_1 must have already been a gap even before Q moved to ℓ . This contradicts the assumption that moving Q to ℓ created an additional gap adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. We conclude Q moving to ℓ does not create a gap at location ℓ_1 , and by symmetry, does not create a gap at location ℓ_3 . Thus, this move must have created a gap at location ℓ_2 , where Q or the particle on the opposite side of this gap is in $\mathcal{W}$. There is necessarily a particle B at location b , a particle C at location c , or a particle D at location d , cases we consider next.

Note this implies location ℓ_2 must be unoccupied. Furthermore, locations ℓ_1 and ℓ_3 must also be unoccupied; if ℓ_1 or ℓ_3 is occupied by a particle P , any gap created at location ℓ_2 by Q moving to ℓ would necessarily already be a gap because of P , contradicting that a new gap is created.

Gap created between Q and B : Suppose a gap is created at ℓ_2 between Q and a particle B at location b , where $\mathcal{W}$ passes through Q or B with ℓ_2 to its left (there may or may not be particles at c or d).

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, ℓ_1 was a gap before Q moved to ℓ . Then $\mathcal{W}$ cannot pass through B or N_1 such that ℓ_1 is on the left of $\mathcal{W}$, as we assumed $\mathcal{W}$ is not adjacent to any gaps




Figure 6: Particle configurations from the analysis of Case 2 of the proof of Lemma 3.10. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Locations with neither could be either occupied or unoccupied. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

except for at its last particle, which is on the far side of ζ from B and N_1 . As $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through N_1 such that ℓ_1 is on the left of $\mathcal{W}$, the only way for Q to be in $\mathcal{W}$ such that ℓ_1 is on the left of the perimeter walk through Q would be if Q was the last particle in $\mathcal{W}$. However, this would imply there was already a gap in the clockwise span from N_2 to N_1 of $n(Q)$ before Q moved to ℓ , impossible as we assumed ℓ was not a gap. We conclude $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through Q or B such that ℓ_1 is left of $\mathcal{W}$, a contradiction.

Thus, if a gap is created at ℓ_2 between Q and a particle B at location b , ℓ_1 was not already a gap before Q moved to ℓ . In this case, the only way for ℓ_2 to become a gap between Q and B is depicted in Figure 6(b): all particles in the clockwise span of $n(\ell_1)$ from B to N_1 must be occupied. While Q moving to ℓ creates a gap at ℓ_2 , subsequently N_1 moving to ℓ_1 eliminates this gap. This is a valid move because, after Q moves to ℓ , N_1 has two or three neighbors, and all are either in $\mathbb{S}$ or adjacent to a particle in $\mathbb{S}$ so Property 1 is satisfied. Thus N_1 moves to ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 is no longer a gap.

Gap created between Q and D : Next, suppose a gap is created adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$ at location ℓ_2 between Q and a particle D at location d , where $\mathcal{W}$ passes through Q or D with ℓ_2 to its left (there may or may not be particles at b or c). We note this is not quite symmetric to the argument in the previous paragraphs for a particle B .

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that ℓ_3 was a gap before Q moved to ℓ . Then $\mathcal{W}$ cannot pass through D or N_2 such that ℓ_3 is left of $\mathcal{W}$, as we assumed $\mathcal{W}$ is not adjacent to any gaps except at its last particle, which is on the far side of ζ from D and N_2 . As $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through N_2 such that ℓ_3 is its left, and Q follows N_2 on any perimeter walk, $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through Q (at ℓ) such that ℓ_3 is on its left. We conclude $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through Q or D such that ℓ_3 is left of $\mathcal{W}$, contradicting the creation of a new gap at ℓ_3 adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$.

Thus, if a gap is created at location ℓ_2 between Q and a particle D at location d , it must be that ℓ_3 was not already a gap before particle Q moved to location ℓ . In this case, the only way for ℓ_2 to become a gap after Q moves to ℓ is depicted in Figure 6(c): all particles in the counterclockwise span of $n(\ell_3)$ from D to N_2 must be occupied. While moving Q to ℓ creates a gap at ℓ_2 , subsequently moving N_2 to ℓ_3 is a valid move satisfying Property 2. Thus this move is made and ℓ_2 is no longer a gap.

Gap created between Q and C : It remains to consider the case where a gap is created at ℓ_2 between Q and a particle C at location c , where $\mathcal{W}$ passes through Q or C with ℓ_2 to its left. As we have already considered the cases where locations b or d are occupied, we assume they are




Figure 7: Particle configurations from the analysis of Case 2 of the proof of Lemma 3.10. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Locations with neither could be either occupied or unoccupied. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

unoccupied; see Figure 7(a).

If C 's neighborhood is not connected, C has exactly two neighbors N'_1 and N'_2 , both incident to a common unoccupied location $l' \in n(C)$; see Figure 7(b). The line through N'_1 and N'_2 is parallel to line ζ , so $\mathcal{W}$ ends on the same side of this line as C . There are strictly fewer than k particles on the opposite side of this line from C . We conclude by induction there exists a sequence of moves such that either C moves to location l' or another particle moves to location l' . In both cases, no gaps are introduced adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. In the first case, l_2 is no longer a gap when particle Q occupies location l and we are done. In the second case, $N(C)$ is now connected, the next case we consider.

Suppose $N(C)$, which is at most size 3, is connected; see Figure 7(c) for an example. As moving particle Q to location l creates a gap at l_2 along $\mathcal{W}$, walk $\mathcal{W}$ passes through C or Q such that location l_2 is to its left. First, if C is in $\mathcal{W}$, because C 's neighbors are connected and fewer than 5, by Lemma 3.8 C can be eliminated. If C is not in $\mathcal{W}$, then Q must be. Particle C moving to position l_2 is a valid move, satisfying Property 2, and C can then be eliminated using Lemma 3.8 as C has exactly one neighbor, Q . After this, l_2 is no longer a gap as particle C has been eliminated. We conclude Q has moved to location l as part of a sequence of moves that does not introduce a gap adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$, as desired. $\square$

Lemma 3.11. *Let σ be a connected configuration with no holes and anchor S such that at least one particle is above or right of S . Suppose there is at least one gap adjacent to the perimeter of σ , and let $\mathcal{W}$ be the shortest perimeter walk starting at S to which a gap is adjacent. There exists a sequence of valid particle moves eliminating a particle or increasing the length of $\mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. First, suppose there are no gaps adjacent to the perimeter of σ . Perimeter walk $\mathcal{W}$ from its start at S until it returns to S the first time satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.9. We conclude there exists a particle on $\mathcal{W}$ between the first two occurrences of S on $\mathcal{W}$ that can be eliminated. If this is not the case, $\mathcal{W}$ as described in the statement of the lemma is well defined, and it has a gap adjacent to its last particle V and no gaps are adjacent to any other particles in $\mathcal{W}$.

If $|\mathcal{W}| = 0$, there must be a gap adjacent to S in the clockwise span of $n(S)$ from the location below and left of S to S 's first neighbor T . If T is above S there cannot be a gap in this span, and by Lemma 3.5 we may assume T is not below and right of S , so we conclude T is above and right of S . This implies there is exactly one gap in the clockwise span of $n(S)$ from the location below and left of S to T , and it is the location l directly above S . This is exactly the case described in Lemma 3.6, so we conclude there exists a sequence of moves for a particle that is not S or T after




Figure 8: Particle configurations appearing in the analysis of cases 2 and 3 of the proof of Lemma 3.11. A black circle indicates a particle is present, and an unfilled dashed circle indicates a particle is not present. Locations with neither could be either occupied or unoccupied. Lines between particles demonstrate adjacencies and do not denote expanded particles.

which ℓ is no longer a gap. After these moves there are no gaps adjacent to S in the clockwise span of $n(S)$ from the location below and left of S to T , so the length of $\mathcal{W}$, the shortest perimeter walk to which a gap is adjacent, has increased by at least one, as desired.

Now, suppose $|\mathcal{W}| \geq 1$. Note the perimeter of σ does not make a left turn at V . If it did, V would have a single unoccupied neighbor in the clockwise span of $n(V)$ from the particle before V to the particle after V on the perimeter of σ , and this location would necessarily be the gap V is adjacent to. But then the particle before V on $\mathcal{W}$ is also adjacent to this gap, contradicting our definition of $\mathcal{W}$ as the minimum length perimeter walk to which a gap is adjacent. In particular, this implies $|N(V)| < 5$.

If $N(V)$ is connected, V satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.8 and there exists a sequence of moves eliminating it. If a particle B appears on $\mathcal{W}$ more than once, by Lemma 3.9, there exists a particle of $\mathcal{W}$ somewhere between the first two occurrences of B that can be eliminated. We now suppose $N(V)$ is not connected, and note this implies $2 \leq |N(V)| \leq 3$ because the perimeter of σ does not make a left turn at V . Furthermore, we assume particle V does not appear on walk $\mathcal{W}$ except as its last vertex. There are three remaining cases to consider.

Case 1. Suppose $|N(V)| = 2$ and it is possible to add exactly one particle to some location ℓ to make $N(V)$ connected. In this case we can't eliminate V immediately because doing so could disconnect σ , so we instead consider V moving to location ℓ . We are in exactly the case of Lemma 3.10, as $\mathcal{W}$ ends at V , which is on the necessary side of the line spanning its two neighbors. We conclude there exists a sequence of moves that brings V to location ℓ or brings some other particle to location ℓ such that no gaps were introduced adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. In the first case, $V \in \mathcal{W}$ is no longer adjacent to a gap: the only possible gap left of $\mathcal{W}$ that V could be adjacent to is the location it previously occupied, which cannot be a gap. In this case $\mathcal{W}$ can be extended beyond V and its length increased, as claimed. In the second case, $N(V)$ has become connected, and by Lemma 3.8 particle V can be eliminated.

Case 2. Suppose $|N(V)| = 3$; we must be more careful in applying Lemma 3.10. At least two of V 's neighbors must be adjacent, and there is a unique location ℓ where we can add a particle to make $N(V)$ connected. We label the neighbors of V adjacent to location ℓ as N_1 and N_2 , where N_1 is clockwise from ℓ and N_2 is counterclockwise from ℓ . We label V 's third neighbor as N_3 , where N_3 is adjacent to N_1 or N_2 , but not adjacent to ℓ .

First, we suppose V 's third neighbor N_3 is adjacent to N_1 ; see Figure 8(a) for this configuration

and a labeling of nearby locations, identical to that used in the Proof of Lemma 3.10. The proof of Lemma 3.10 almost applies; the only argument that fails due to the existence of particle N_3 is the last paragraph of the analysis of the case titled *Gap created between Q and B* , with particle V now playing the role of particle Q . This situation arises if location b is occupied by a particle B and location ℓ_1 was not a gap before V moved to ℓ . The only way for ℓ_2 to be a gap and ℓ_1 to not be a gap is depicted in Figure 8(b). Recall we removed the gap created at ℓ_2 by subsequently moving N_1 to ℓ_1 ; however, this is no longer valid because of N_3 . We now argue this case cannot possibly occur. By assumption, the clockwise perimeter walk $N_2 - V - N_1$ is not in $\mathcal{W}$ because V appears at most once on this walk, as its last particle. This implies $\mathcal{W}$ does not pass through B such that ℓ_2 is to its left. We conclude moving V to location ℓ could not have created a gap between B and V adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$.

A similar argument shows if N_3 is adjacent to N_2 , the identical problematic configuration where a gap is created between V and particle D at location d also could not occur. In this case we crucially use the fact that $\mathcal{W}$ ends at V such that ℓ is on its right side, and in particular $\mathcal{W}$ does not end on the clockwise perimeter traversal from D to N_2 to V .

The only cases for which the proof of Lemma 3.10 does not provide a valid sequence of moves to accomplish the desired result do not occur. Thus the conclusions of Lemma 3.10 can be applied to V . There exists a sequence of valid particle moves such that V moves to location ℓ or some other particle moves to location ℓ , and after this sequence of moves there are no additional gaps adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$. In the first case, there is no longer a gap adjacent to walk $\mathcal{W}$ at particle V so $|\mathcal{W}|$ has increased; the only possibility for such a gap is the location V previously occupied, which cannot be a gap. In the second case, V now satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 3.8 because $N(V)$ is connected, so V can be eliminated.

Case 3. Suppose V has exactly two neighbors, and they are on opposite sides of V . In this case, we have no hope of eliminating a gap from $n(V)$ by moving V , so we instead turn to the particle on the opposite side of the gap adjacent to V . Because V is adjacent to some gap g , and particle P before V on $\mathcal{W}$ is not adjacent to g or to any gap, the particles locally near V must look as in Figure 8(c). We let Q be the particle on the opposite side of gap g from V . Because g is a gap and neither P nor any other particle before P in $\mathcal{W}$ is adjacent to a gap, Q can have at most three neighbors.

If $N(Q)$ is not connected, Q satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.11, and there exists a sequence of moves such that Q moves away from gap g or some other particle moves adjacent to Q . In either case, no gaps adjacent to $\mathcal{W}$ are introduced. In the first case, there is no longer a gap adjacent to V and $\mathcal{W}$ can be extended. In the second case, $N(Q)$ has become connected. If $N(Q)$ is connected, then Q moving from its current location to gap location g is a valid move, satisfying Property 2. Particle Q can then be eliminated by Lemma 3.8. $\square$

Lemma 3.12. *There exists a sequence of moves from any configuration σ to a straight line.*

Proof. We apply Lemma 3.11 fewer than $2n^2$ times to eliminate all particles: a particle must be eliminated at least once every $2n$ steps, as the length of $\mathcal{W}$ can increase at most $p(\sigma) < 2n$ times in a row. After this, all particles have been eliminated and they form a line stretching down and left from S . $\square$

We present one more lemma before proving $\mathcal{M}$ is irreducible. The following lemma ensures if there exists a valid sequence of moves transforming σ into a line, then there exists a valid sequences of moves transforming the line back into σ . Recall $P(\sigma, \tau)$ is the probability of moving from state σ to state τ in one step of $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 3.13. *For any two configurations σ and τ in Ω , if $P(\sigma, \tau) > 0$ then $P(\tau, \sigma) > 0$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega$ be any two configurations such that $P(\sigma, \tau) > 0$. This means σ and τ differ by one particle P at location ℓ in σ and at adjacent location ℓ' in τ .

Note in τ , particle P at location ℓ' has at most four neighbors. This is because $\ell \in n(\ell')$ is unoccupied as particle P is instead at ℓ' , and at least one other location in $n(\ell')$ is unoccupied as otherwise ℓ' would have been a hole in σ , impossible by Lemma 3.2. Because $P(\sigma, \tau) > 0$, Property 1 or Property 2 must hold for ℓ and ℓ' . Both properties are symmetric with regard to the role played by ℓ and ℓ' . If Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$, in state τ , selects in Step 1 particle P , location $\ell \in n(P)$, and a sufficiently small probability q , then because Conditions 1, 2, and 3 are necessarily satisfied, particle P moves to location ℓ . This proves $P(\tau, \sigma) > 0$. $\square$

Lemma 3.14. *Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ connects the state space of all connected configurations without holes.*

Proof. Let σ and τ be any two connected configurations of n particles with no holes. By Lemma 3.12, there exists a sequence of moves transforming σ into a line with slope $1/\sqrt{3}$. By Lemmas 3.12 and 3.13, there exists a sequence of valid moves transforming this line into τ . $\square$

Corollary 3.15. *$\mathcal{M}$ is ergodic.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.14, the state space is connected. $\mathcal{M}$ is aperiodic as at each iteration there is a probability of at least $1/6$ that no move is made. Therefore $\mathcal{M}$ is ergodic. $\square$

3.5 The stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$

We now know the Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ is ergodic and finite, so its stationary distribution is unique.

Lemma 3.16. *The stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is*

$$\pi(\sigma) = \lambda^{t(\sigma)} / Z,$$

where $Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{t(\sigma)}$ is the normalizing constant, also called the partition function.

Proof. We confirm π is the stationary distribution by detailed balance. Let σ and τ be configurations in Ω with $\sigma \neq \tau$ such that $P(\sigma, \tau) > 0$. By Lemma 3.13, also $P(\tau, \sigma) > 0$. Suppose particle P moves from location ℓ in σ to neighboring location ℓ' in τ . Let t be the number of triangles on which P is incident when it is in location ℓ , and let t' be that number when P is in location ℓ' . This implies $t(\sigma) - t(\tau) = t - t'$. Without loss of generality, let $t' < t$. We see

$$P(\sigma, \tau) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{6} \cdot \lambda^{t'-t} \quad \text{and} \quad P(\tau, \sigma) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{6} \cdot 1.$$

We now show σ and τ satisfy the detailed balance condition:

$$\pi(\sigma)P(\sigma, \tau) = \frac{\lambda^{t(\sigma)}}{Z} \frac{\lambda^{t'-t}}{6n} = \frac{\lambda^{t(\tau)}}{Z \cdot 6n} = \pi(\tau)P(\tau, \sigma).$$

We conclude π is the stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$. $\square$

While it is natural to assume maximizing the number of triangles in a particle configuration results in more compression, here we formalize this. We prove π can also be expressed in terms of perimeter. This implies $\mathcal{M}$ converges to a distribution weighted by the perimeter of configurations, a global characteristic, even though the probability of any particle move is determined only by local information.

Corollary 3.17. *The stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is also given by*

$$\pi(\sigma) = \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} / Z,$$

where $Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}$ is the normalizing constant, also called the partition function.

Proof. We use Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 3.16:

$$\pi(\sigma) = \frac{\lambda^{t(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{t(\sigma)}} = \frac{\lambda^{2n-p(\sigma)-2}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{2n-p(\sigma)-2}} = \frac{\lambda^{2n-2}}{\lambda^{2n-2}} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{-p(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}} = \frac{\lambda^{-p(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}}.$$

□

The stationary distribution of $\mathcal{M}$ can also be expressed in terms of edges.

Corollary 3.18. *The stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is also given by*

$$\pi(\sigma) = \lambda^{e(\sigma)} / Z,$$

where $Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{e(\sigma)}$ is the normalizing constant, also called the partition function.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 3.17:

$$\pi(\sigma) = \frac{\lambda^{-p(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}} = \frac{\lambda^{-(3n-e(\sigma)-3)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-(3n-e(\sigma)-3)}} = \frac{\lambda^{-3n+3}}{\lambda^{-3n+3}} \cdot \frac{\lambda^{e(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{e(\sigma)}} = \frac{\lambda^{e(\sigma)}}{\sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{e(\sigma)}}.$$

□

3.6 Convergence Time of Markov Chain $\mathcal{M}$

We prove in Section 5 that when $\lambda > 2 + \sqrt{2}$, if Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ has converged to its stationary distribution, then with all but exponentially small probability the particle system will be compressed. However, we do not give explicit bounds on the time required for this to occur; we give experimental evidence of convergence times in Section 7, but believe proving rigorous bounds will be challenging.

A common measure of convergence time of a Markov chain is the *mixing time*, the number of iterations until the distribution is within total variation distance ε of the stationary distribution, starting from the worst initial configuration. Bounding the mixing time of a Markov chain achieving compression is likely to be challenging because of the similarity to physical systems such as the Ising and Potts models, common models for ferromagnetism. Algorithms that perform local updates are known to have exponential mixing time for many of these models precisely because of a type of compression of the systems [21]. However, mixing time most likely is not the correct measure of our algorithm's convergence. Even if it takes exponential time for $\mathcal{M}$ to converge to its stationary distribution, which is certainly plausible, it may be true that the particles achieve α -compression after only a polynomial number of steps. In fact, based on simulations, it appears compression occurs in polynomial time; doubling the number of particles consistently results in a ten-fold increase in iterations until compression starting from a straight line of n particles, so we conjecture the number of iterations until compression occurs is close to $O(n^{3.3})$.




Figure 9: (a) The hexagonal lattice. (b) A self-avoiding walk in the hexagonal lattice. (c) A walk that is not self-avoiding.

4 Counting Particle Configurations by Perimeter

Before we prove our main results about particle compression, we first present some crucial lemmas focusing on counting the number of particle configurations with a given perimeter. Having good bounds on these numbers will strengthen the results about compression and expansion in the stationary distribution π of algorithm $\mathcal{M}$ in the next section. In particular, if S_α is the set of all particle configurations with perimeter at least $\alpha \cdot p_{\min}$, we wish to have an upper bound on $\pi(S_\alpha) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_\alpha} \pi(\sigma) / Z$ in order to argue that the stationary probability of a configuration having large perimeter is small. Letting m_k denote the number of configurations with perimeter k , using Corollary 3.17 we can write $\pi(S_\alpha)$ as

$$\pi(S_\alpha) = \frac{\sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} m_k \lambda^{-k}}{Z}$$

In order to give an upper bound on $\pi(S_\alpha)$, we must first establish an upper bound on m_k , which we do in Section 4.1.

In proving particle compression we use a trivial lower bound on the normalizing constant $Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}$ in the equation above, noting $Z \geq \lambda^{-p_{\min}}$, the weight of the configuration with minimum perimeter. However, in proving expansion properties for small λ we require a much better bound on the normalizing constant Z . In particular, if S^α is the set of all configurations with perimeter at most $\alpha \cdot p_{\max}$ for some constant $\alpha < 1$, we wish to show $\pi(S^\alpha) = \sum_{\sigma \in S^\alpha} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} / Z$ is small, and we do so by showing Z is large. We give a lower bound on Z in Section 4.2 that is valid for all $\lambda > 0$ and a lower bound in Section 4.3 that is valid for all $\lambda \geq 1$. As above, doing so requires a bound on the number of configurations with certain perimeters.

4.1 An upper bound on the number of configurations with perimeter k

We turn to lattice duality and self-avoiding walks; for a more thorough treatment of self-avoiding walks, see, e.g., [2].

Definition 4.1. *A self-avoiding walk (SAW) in a planar lattice is a walk beginning at the origin that never visits the same vertex twice.*

We will focus on SAWs in the hexagonal lattice, also called the honeycomb lattice (Figure 9(a)); examples of self-avoiding walks and non-self avoiding walks in this lattice are shown in Figure 9 (b) and (c), respectively. The hexagonal lattice is of interest because it is dual to the triangular lattice that particles occupy in our model. That is, if you create a new vertex in every face of the




Figure 10: (a) The duality between the triangular lattice and the hexagonal lattice. (b) An example of a particle configuration σ , the polygon A_σ (shaded), and the self-avoiding walk in the hexagonal lattice that bounds A_σ (bold).

triangular lattice and connect two of these new vertices if their corresponding faces have a common edge, you obtain the hexagonal lattice; see Figure 10(a).

Theorem 4.2 ([11]). *The l^{th} root of the number of self-avoiding walks of length ℓ in the hexagonal lattice from a given starting vertex x converges to μ_{hex} as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mu_{\text{hex}} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}$ is the connective constant of the hexagonal lattice.*

Lemma 4.3. *The number of particle configurations with n particles and perimeter k is at most $f(k) \cdot (2 + \sqrt{2})^k$ for some subexponential function f .*

Proof. To prove this theorem, we will consider the dual to the triangular lattice Γ , which is the hexagonal lattice Γ' . For any connected particle configuration σ with n particles and no holes, consider the union A_σ of all the faces of Γ' corresponding to vertices of Γ that are occupied in σ . Whenever two particles are adjacent in Γ , their corresponding faces in Γ' share an edge. This union A_σ is a connected simple polygon because σ is connected and has no holes. Thus, the perimeter of A_σ is a self-avoiding polygon in the hexagonal lattice, where a self-avoiding polygon is simply a self-avoiding walk that starts and ends at the same vertex.

We next claim that if σ has perimeter k , then the perimeter of A_σ has $2k + 6$ edges (equivalently, $2k + 6$ vertices). Consider an appearance of a particle Q on the perimeter of σ with exterior angle θ_Q , where $\theta_Q = 120, 180, 240, 300$, or 360 degrees. The corresponding hexagon H_Q in the hexagonal lattice then has $(\theta_Q/60) - 1$ of its corresponding edges in the perimeter of A_σ . Additionally, any hexagon with edges on the boundary of A_σ necessarily corresponds to a particle Q appearing on the perimeter of σ , and vice versa. For particle configurations σ with perimeter k , we conclude the number of edges on the perimeter of A_σ is

$$p(A_\sigma) = \sum_{Q \in p(\sigma)} \left(\frac{\theta_Q}{60} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{60} \left(\sum_{Q \in p(\sigma)} \theta_Q \right) - k = \frac{1}{60} (180k + 360) - k = 2k + 6.$$

The number of self-avoiding polygons of perimeter $2k + 6$ in Γ' is an upper bound on the number of particle configurations with perimeter k . This value is itself less than the number of self-avoiding walks of length $2k + 5$ in Γ' . As the connective constant for the hexagonal lattice is $\mu_{\text{hex}} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}$, the number of self avoiding walks of this length converges to $\mu_{\text{hex}}^{2k+5} = \mu_{\text{hex}}^5 (2 + \sqrt{2})^k$ as k goes to

infinity. In particular, there is some subexponential function $f(k)$ such that the number of self-avoiding walks of length $2k + 5$ is at most $f(k) \cdot (2 + \sqrt{2})^k$. $\square$

4.2 A lower bound on normalizing constant Z

As discussed above, to strengthen our expansion results we first find a lower bound for the normalizing constant Z ; this exploration will again proceed via counting the number of configurations with n particles and a given perimeter. To begin, we recall $p_{max} = 2n - 2$ and note

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} \geq \sum_{\sigma: p(\sigma)=p_{max}} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} \geq m_{2n-2} \lambda^{-(2n-2)},$$

where m_{2n-2} is the number of configurations with perimeter exactly $2n-2$. Note if a configuration σ with n particles has perimeter $2n-2$, then it must be that σ has exactly $n-1$ edges and no triangles; that is, σ is an induced tree in Γ . We present a method for enumerating a subset of these trees, giving a lower bound on m_{2n-2} .

Lemma 4.4. *For any λ , $Z \geq (\sqrt{2}/\lambda)^{p_{max}}$.*

Proof. We enumerate n -vertex paths in Γ where every step is either down-right or up-right; this is a subset of the trees contributing to m_{2n-2} . Starting from the first particle, there are 2^{n-1} ways to place rest of the particles to form such a path, where each one is either up-right or down-right from the previous one. This gives $m_{2n-2} \geq 2^{n-1} = \sqrt{2}^{2n-2} = \sqrt{2}^{p_{max}}$. From this, it follows that

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} \geq \sum_{\sigma: p(\sigma)=p_{max}} \lambda^{-p_{max}} \geq \sqrt{2}^{p_{max}} \lambda^{-p_{max}} = (\sqrt{2}/\lambda)^{p_{max}}.$$

$\square$

As we will see in Section 5, this directly implies the particles do not compress, even in the limit, for any $\lambda < \sqrt{2}$. This bound can be improved significantly with a better lower bound for m_{2n-2} , though this is eclipsed by the lower bound for Z when $\lambda \geq 1$ given in the next subsection.

4.3 An improved lower bound on normalizing constant Z for $\lambda \geq 1$

In this section we provide an improved bound on Z when $\lambda \geq 1$. The key observation is that for $\lambda > 1$, for any value $k < 2n - 2$, $\lambda^{-k} \geq \lambda^{-(2n-2)}$. Thus as $p_{max} = 2n - 2$, it follows that

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} \geq \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-(2n-2)}$$

Thus it suffices to find a lower bound on the total number of connected, hole-free configurations with n particles and any perimeter, instead of only counting the number of configurations with maximum perimeter; exploiting this, we will be able to get a better lower bound on Z than in the case above where λ was unrestricted.

Lemma 4.5. *For $\lambda \geq 1$, $Z \geq 0.12 \cdot (1.67/\lambda)^{p_{max}}$.*

Proof. We first give a lower bound on the number of connected, hole-free configurations on n particles by iteratively constructing a subset of them. Note there are 11 connected hole-free configurations with exactly 3 particles. Construct a particle configuration beginning with one particle P , and attach one of the 11 configurations with 3 particles to the right of P , either by placing its highest leftmost particle H below and right of P , or by placing its lowest leftmost particle L above




Figure 11: The iterative process of Lemma 4.5. (a) One of the 11 connected hole-free configurations on 3 vertices, and the two ways it can attach to the single particle with which the iterative process begins. (b) Another of the 11 connected hole-free configurations on 3 vertices, and the two ways it can attach to a partially constructed configuration.

and right of P ; see Figure 11(a) for an example. In the first case, all locations directly below P and all locations directly above H are unoccupied; this ensures no cycles and thus no holes have been created. Similarly in the second case, all locations above P or below L are unoccupied, ensuring no holes form. Thus, using this process, there are 22 possible ways to attach 3 particles to P to yield a hole-free configuration with 4 particles: each of the 11 hole-free configurations on 3 particles can be attached to P in two ways. We note this does not construct all hole-free configurations of 4 particles, but constructs a subset via a process that will iterate nicely, as we now see.

For some hole-free configuration σ with $1 + 3j$ particles, $j \geq 1$, let P be the highest rightmost particle of σ and let Q be the lowest rightmost particle of σ ; possibly $P = Q$. Choose any of the 11 hole-free configurations with 3 particles, and let L be its lowest leftmost particle and H be its highest leftmost particle; possibly $H = L$. Attach this configuration to σ either by placing H below and right of Q or by placing L above and right of P ; see Figure 11(b) for an example. Note even if $Q = P$ and $H = L$, this still results in two distinct attachments. In the first case, the locations directly below Q and the locations directly above H are necessarily all unoccupied. This implies the only adjacency between σ and the newly added configuration is between Q and H ; thus a cycle is not created and the resulting configuration is hole free. The same conclusion follows in the second case by examining the locations above P and the locations below L .

This process, applied j times, will yield a unique hole-free configuration on $1 + 3j$ particles. If $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, up to two additional particles can be added to the right of σ in some deterministic way to form a configuration on n particles. At each step, there are $2 \cdot 11 = 22$ ways to attach the next three particles; this process thus enumerates $(22)^j = 22^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor}$ configurations on n particles. This implies the total number of configurations with n particles is at least

$$22^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{3} \rfloor} \geq 22^{\frac{n-1}{3}} \cdot 22^{-2/3} = 22^{-2/3} (22^{1/6})^{2n-2} > 0.12 \cdot 1.67^{2n-2}.$$

Using this bound, it follows that

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-p(\sigma)} \geq \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-(2n-2)} > 0.12 \cdot 1.67^{2n-2} \cdot \lambda^{-(2n-2)} = 0.12 \cdot \left(\frac{1.67}{\lambda}\right)^{p_{max}}.$$

□

This bound can be improved even farther, using a result of Jensen [16]. In that paper, the author presents a parallel algorithm efficient enough to enumerate the number of benzenoid hydrocarbons containing h hexagonal cells up to $h = 50$. A benzenoid hydrocarbon containing h hexagonal cells is exactly equivalent to a connected particle configuration with no holes and h particles, implying the next lemma.

Lemma 4.6 ([16]). *The number of connected particle configurations with no holes and 50 particles is 2,430,068,453,031,180,290,203,185,942,420,933.*

Lemma 4.7. *For $\lambda > 1$, $Z \geq 0.13 \cdot (2.17/\lambda)^{p_{max}}$.*

Proof. We use the same approach as in Lemma 4.5, noting that $2.17 \sim (2N_{50})^{1/100}$. Write n as $n = 1 + 50i + j$, where $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $j < 50$; note subject to these requirements, i and j are unique. Iteratively construct a particle configuration σ by beginning with one particle and repeatedly attaching one of the N_{50} configurations with 50 particles to the right as in the proof of Lemma 4.5: place its highest leftmost particle H below and right of σ 's lowest rightmost particle Q , or place its lowest leftmost particle L above and right of σ 's highest rightmost particle P . For the same reasons as in the previous lemma, this process, applied i times, will yield a hole-free configuration on $n - j$ particles. Attach the remaining j particles as one of the N_j configurations on j particles, again attaching it in one of the two ways described above. This yields a connected hole-free configuration on n particles. Using this method, we enumerate $(2N_{50})^i \cdot 2N_j$ unique hole-free configurations on n particles. It follows that the number of connected hole-free configurations on n particles is at least

$$(2N_{50})^i \cdot 2N_j = (2N_{50})^{\frac{n-1-j}{50}} \cdot 2N_j = (2N_{50})^{\frac{n-1}{50}} \cdot (2N_{50})^{-\frac{j}{50}} \cdot 2N_j.$$

Calculations show that for all $0 \leq j < 50$, $(2N_{50})^{-j/50} \cdot 2N_j \geq 0.13$. It follows that the number of connected hole-free configurations with n particles is at least

$$0.13 \cdot \left((2N_{50})^{1/100}\right)^{2n-2} = 0.13 \cdot \left((2N_{50})^{1/100}\right)^{p_{max}}.$$

Noting that $(2N_{50})^{1/100} > 2.17$, it follows that

$$Z \geq \sum_{\sigma} \lambda^{-(2n-2)} \geq 0.13 \cdot (2.17)^{p_{max}} \lambda^{-p_{max}} = 0.13 \cdot (2.17/\lambda)^{p_{max}}.$$

□

As we will see in Section 6, this directly implies that the particle system will not exhibit compression for any $\lambda < 2.17$. We expect this bound will improve given accurate counts of the number of particle configurations for even larger n . However, computationally this seems infeasible, and a careful analysis of the work done in [16] suggests the best bound achievable by this method would be expansion for all $\lambda < 2.27$, only a mild improvement and still far from the known lower bound for compression, $2 + \sqrt{2}$.

5 Achieving Compression

If $\mathcal{M}$ executes long enough, it will converge to its stationary distribution π ; we will use the expression of π given in Corollary 3.17. To simplify notation, we define the *weight* of a configuration σ to be $w(\sigma) = \lambda^{-p(\sigma)}$. For a set $S \subseteq \Omega$, we define $w(S)$ as the sum of the weights of all configurations in S . We now show that, provided λ and n are large enough, with all but exponentially small probability if $\mathcal{M}$ is at stationarity then the particles are in an α -compressed configuration. Constant $\alpha > 1$ can be as close to 1 as desired, though smaller α requires larger λ . We now prove our main result.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $\alpha > 1$, there exists $\lambda^* = (2 + \sqrt{2})^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$, $n^* \geq 0$, and $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $\lambda > \lambda^*$ and $n > n^*$, the probability that a random sample σ drawn according to the stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is not α -compressed is exponentially small:*

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) \geq \alpha \cdot p_{\min}) < \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. Let S_α be the set of configurations of perimeter at least $\alpha \cdot p_{\min}$. Let $\sigma_{\min}$ be a configuration of n particles achieving the minimum perimeter $p_{\min}$. We show

$$\pi(S_\alpha) = \frac{w(S_\alpha)}{Z} < \frac{w(S_\alpha)}{w(\sigma_{\min})} \leq \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The first equality is the definition of π ; the next inequality follows from the definitions of Z and w . We focus on the last inequality. For simplicity, we let $\nu := 2 + \sqrt{2} \sim 3.42$. Applying Lemma 4.3 and noting the weight of any σ with $p(\sigma) = k$ is $\lambda^{-p(\sigma)} = \lambda^{-k}$, we sum over S_α :

$$\frac{w(S_\alpha)}{w(\sigma_{\min})} \leq \frac{\sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k}}{\lambda^{-p_{\min}}} = \sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} f(k) \nu^{(1-\log_\nu \lambda)k + (\log_\nu \lambda)p_{\min}},$$

where f is the subexponential function from Lemma 4.3. Using the inequality $p_{\min} \leq k/\alpha$, it follows that

$$\frac{w(S_\alpha)}{w(\sigma_{\min})} \leq \sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} f(k) \nu^{(1-\log_\nu \lambda)k + (\log_\nu \lambda)(k/\alpha)} = \sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} f(k) \nu^{(1-(1-1/\alpha)\log_\nu \lambda)k}.$$

As $\lambda > \lambda^* = \nu^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$, then $0 > 1 - (1 - 1/\alpha) \log_\nu \lambda =: -c_1$. Also $k \geq \alpha \cdot p_{\min}$, and by Lemma 2.1, $p_{\min} > \sqrt{n}$, so

$$\frac{w(S_\alpha)}{w(\sigma_{\min})} \leq \sum_{k=\lceil \alpha \cdot p_{\min} \rceil}^{2n-2} f(k) \nu^{-c_1 \cdot 2\alpha \sqrt{n}} \leq f'(n) (\nu^{-2\alpha c_1})^{\sqrt{n}},$$

where $f'(n) = \sum_{k=\sqrt{n}}^n f(k)$ is a subexponential function. There exists $\gamma < 1$ and n^* such that for all $n \geq n^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) \geq \alpha \cdot p_{\min}) = \pi(S_\alpha) \leq \frac{w(S_\alpha)}{w(\sigma_{\min})} \leq f'(n) (\nu^{-2\alpha c_1})^{\sqrt{n}} < \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

□

Corollary 5.2. *For any $\lambda > 2 + \sqrt{2} =: \nu$, there exists a constant $\alpha = \log_\nu \lambda / (\log_\nu \lambda - 1)$, $n^* \geq 0$, and $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $n > n^*$, a random sample σ drawn according to the stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) \geq \alpha \cdot p_{\min}) < \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

6 Using $\mathcal{M}$ for Expansion

A nice feature of our algorithm is that it also provably achieves particle expansion for different values of bias parameter λ . We say a configuration σ is β -expanded for some $\beta < 1$ if $p(\sigma) > \beta \cdot p_{max}$, where $p_{max} = 2n - 2$. We note as $p_{max} = \Theta(n)$ and $p_{min} = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ for a system of n particles, β -expansion and α -compression for any constants β and α are mutually exclusive for sufficiently large n . We show that, provided n is large enough, for all $0 < \lambda < 2.17$ there is a constant β such that with all but exponentially small probability, if $\mathcal{M}$ is at stationarity then the particles are β -expanded. This is notable because it implies, counterintuitively, that $\lambda > 1$ is not sufficient to guarantee particle compression as one might first guess.

Theorem 6.1. *For all $0 < \beta < 1$, there exists $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(\beta) < \sqrt{2}$, $n^* \geq 0$, and $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and $n > n^*$, the particles achieve β -expansion with all but exponentially small probability: for a configuration σ drawn at random according to stationary distribution π ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) < \beta \cdot p_{max}) \leq \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. Again, for simplicity let $\nu := 2 + \sqrt{2}$. Let

$$\lambda < \lambda^* = \nu^{\frac{\beta - \frac{\log_\nu 2}{2}}{\beta - 1}} < \nu^{\frac{0 - \frac{\log_\nu 2}{2}}{0 - 1}} = \sqrt{2}.$$

Let S_β be the set of configurations σ with $p(\sigma) \leq \beta \cdot p_{max}$. We show

$$\pi(S_\beta) = \frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Applying Lemma 4.4 and then Lemma 4.3, we see

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \frac{w(S_\beta)}{\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\lambda}\right)^{p_{max}}} \leq \frac{\sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k}}{\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\lambda}\right)^{p_{max}}} = \sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{p_{max}},$$

where $f(k)$ is the subexponential function from Lemma 4.3. Recalling that $k < \beta \cdot p_{max}$, we see

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^{\frac{k}{\beta}} = \sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^{k \left(1 - \log_\nu \lambda + \frac{\log_\nu \lambda}{\beta} - \frac{\log_\nu 2}{2\beta}\right)}.$$

Let c_3 be such that

$$-c_3 = 1 - \log_\nu \lambda + \frac{\log_\nu \lambda}{\beta} - \frac{\log_\nu 2}{2\beta}.$$

We want $-c_3 < 0$, so we solve for λ and see $-c_3 < 0$ precisely when $\lambda < \lambda^*$, a condition we know to hold. Recalling Lemma 2.1, it follows that

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^{-c_3 k} \leq \sum_{k=p_{min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}} \leq f'(n) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}},$$

where $f'(n) = \sum_{k=\sqrt{n}}^n f(k)$ is a subexponential function. Hence there exists $n^* \geq 0$ and $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $n \geq n^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) \leq \beta \cdot p_{max}) = \pi(S_\beta) = \frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq f'(n) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}} < \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

□

Corollary 6.2. *For all $0 < \lambda < \sqrt{2}$, there exists a constant $0 < \beta < 1$ such that with all but exponentially small probability a sample drawn according to stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is β -expanded.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the previous theorem; for $\lambda < \sqrt{2}$, there exists β such that $\lambda < \lambda^*(\beta)$. $\square$

When we know $\lambda \geq 1$, the improved bounds in Lemma 4.7 can be used to show β -expansion occurs for some β for an even greater range of values for λ . We note larger values of λ necessitate smaller, but still constant, values of β .

Theorem 6.3. *For all $1 \leq \lambda < (2 \cdot N_{50})^{1/100} \sim 2.17$, there exists a constant $0 < \beta < 1$ such that with all but exponentially small probability a sample drawn according to stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is β -expanded.*

Proof. For simplicity we prove the above result for all $\lambda < 2.17$, though the result (and the proof) actually hold for all $\lambda < (2 \cdot N_{50})^{1/100} \sim 2.172033329\dots$. As above, let $\nu := 2 + \sqrt{2}$. Let

$$\beta < \beta^* = \frac{\log_\nu \left(\frac{2.17}{\lambda} \right)}{1 - \log_\nu \lambda}.$$

Let S_β be the set of configurations σ with $p(\sigma) \leq \beta \cdot p_{\max}$. We show there is a constant $\gamma < 1$ such that

$$\pi(S_\beta) = \frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Applying Lemma 4.7 and then Lemma 4.3 and noting $0.13^{-1} < 8$, we see

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \frac{w(S_\beta)}{0.13 \cdot \left(\frac{2.17}{\lambda} \right)^{p_{\max}}} < 8 \cdot \frac{\sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k}}{\left(\frac{2.17}{\lambda} \right)^{p_{\max}}} = \sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} 8f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2.17} \right)^{p_{\max}},$$

where $f(k)$ is the subexponential function from Lemma 4.3. Recalling that $k < \beta \cdot p_{\max}$, we see

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} 8f(k) \nu^k \lambda^{-k} \left(\frac{\lambda}{2.17} \right)^{\frac{k}{\beta}} = \sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} 8f(k) \nu^{k(1 - \log_\nu \lambda + \frac{\log_\nu(\lambda/2.17)}{\beta})}.$$

Let c_3 be such that

$$-c_3 = 1 - \log_\nu \lambda + \frac{\log_\nu \left(\frac{\lambda}{2.17} \right)}{\beta}.$$

We want $-c_3 < 0$, so we solve for β and see $-c_3 < 0$ precisely when $\beta < \beta^*$, a condition we know to hold. Recalling Lemma 2.1,

$$\frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq \sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} 8f(k) \nu^{-c_3 k} \leq \sum_{k=p_{\min}}^{\lfloor \beta \cdot p_{\max} \rfloor} 8f(k) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}} \leq f'(n) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}},$$

where $f'(n) = \sum_{k=\sqrt{n}}^n 8f(k)$ is a subexponential function. Hence there exists $n^* \geq 0$ and $\gamma < 1$ such that for all $n \geq n^*$,

$$\mathbb{P}(p(\sigma) \leq \beta \cdot p_{\max}) = \pi(S_\beta) = \frac{w(S_\beta)}{Z} \leq f'(n) \nu^{-c_3 \sqrt{n}} < \gamma^{\sqrt{n}}.$$

$\square$




Figure 12: 100 particles in a line with occupied edges drawn, after (a) 1 million, (b) 2 million, (c) 3 million, (d) 4 million, and (e) 5 million iterations of $\mathcal{M}$ with bias $\lambda = 4$.

Corollary 6.4. *For all $0 \leq \lambda < 2.17$, there exists a constant $0 < \beta < 1$ such that with all but exponentially small probability a sample drawn according to stationary distribution π of $\mathcal{M}$ is β -expanded.*

Proof. Corollary 6.2 and Theorem 6.3. □

7 Simulations

In practice, Markov chain $\mathcal{M}$ yields good compression. We simulated $\mathcal{M}$ for $\lambda = 4$ on 100 particles that began in a line; the configurations after 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 million steps of $\mathcal{M}$ are shown in Figure 12.

In contrast, $\lambda = 2$, while still favoring particles forming triangles, does not appear to yield compression; see Figure 13, where even after 20 million simulated steps of $\mathcal{M}$, the particles have not compressed. We conjecture there is a phase transition in λ , i.e., a critical value λ_c such that for all $\lambda > \lambda_c$ the particles compress and for all $\lambda < \lambda_c$ they do not compress. Such phase transitions exist for similar statistical physics models (e.g., [3]). Our proofs indicate if λ_c exists, then $2.17 \leq \lambda_c \leq 2 + \sqrt{2}$.

References

- [1] E. Bampas, J. Czyzowicz, L. Gąsieniec, D. Ilcinkas, and A. Labourel. Almost optimal asynchronous rendezvous in infinite multidimensional grids. In *Distributed Comp.: 24th Int. Symp.*,




Figure 13: 100 particles in a line with occupied edges drawn, after (a) 10 million and (b) 20 million iterations of $\mathcal{M}$ with bias $\lambda = 2$.

DISC 2010, pages 297–311, 2010.

- [2] R. Bauerschmidt, H. Duminil-Copin, J. Goodman, and G. Slade. Lectures on self-avoiding walks. *Clay Mathematics Proceedings*, 15, 2012.
- [3] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, A. Frieze, J.H. Kim, P. Tetali, E. Vigoda, and V.H. Vu. Torpid mixing of some MCMC algorithms in statistical physics. In *40th IEEE Symp. on Found. of Comp. Sci.*, FOCS 1999, pages 218–229, 1999.
- [4] S. Camazine, K.P. Visscher, J. Finley, and S.R. Vetter. House-hunting by honey bee swarms: Collective decisions and individual behaviors. *Insectes Sociaux*, 46:348–360.
- [5] A. Chavoya and Y. Duthen. Using a genetic algorithm to evolve cellular automata for 2D/3D computational development. In *Genetic and Evolut. Comp. Conf., GECCO 2006*.
- [6] Z. Derakhshandeh, R. Gmyr, A.W. Richa, C. Scheideler, and T. Strothmann. An algorithmic framework for shape formation problems in self-organizing particle systems. In *Proc. of the 2nd Ann. Int. Conf. on Nanoscale Computing and Comm., NANOCOM' 15*, pages 21:1–21:2, 2015.
- [7] Z. Derakhshandeh, R. Gmyr, A.W. Richa, C. Scheideler, and T. Strothmann. Universal shape formation for programmable matter. In *To appear, 28th ACM Symp. on Parallelism in Alg. and Arch., SPAA '16*, 2016. To appear.
- [8] Z. Derakhshandeh, R. Gmyr, T. Strothmann, R.A. Bazzi, A.W. Richa, and C. Scheideler. Leader election and shape formation with self-organizing programmable matter. In *21st DNA Comp. and Molec. Prog., DNA 21*, pages 117–132, 2015.
- [9] A. Deutsch and S. Dormann. *Cellular Automaton Modeling of Biological Pattern Formation: Characterization, Applications, and Analysis*. Modeling and Simulation in Science, Eng. and Technology. Birkhäuser Boston, 2007.
- [10] R.L. Dobrushin. The problem of uniqueness of a gibbsian random field and the problem of phase transitions. *Functional Analysis and Its Applications*, 2:302–312, 1968.

- [11] H. Duminil-Copin and S. Smirnov. The connective constant of the honeycomb lattice equals $\sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}$. *Annals of Mathematics*, 175:1653–1665, 2012.
- [12] W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, volume 1. Wiley, 1968.
- [13] P. Flocchini, G. Prencipe, N. Santoro, and P. Widmayer. Arbitrary pattern formation by asynchronous, anonymous, oblivious robots. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 407:412–447, 2008.
- [14] W. K. Hastings. Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57:97–109, 1970.
- [15] R. Jeanson, C. Rivault, J.L. Deneubourg, S. Blanco, R. Fournier, C. Jost, and G. Theraulaz. Self-organized aggregation in cockroaches. *Animal Behaviour*, 69:169 – 180, 2005.
- [16] Iwan Jensen. A parallel algorithm for the enumeration of benzenoid hydrocarbons. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2009(02):P02065, 2009.
- [17] N. Lynch. *Distributed Algorithms*. Morgan Kaufman, 1996.
- [18] N.J. Mlot, C.A. Tovey, and D.L. Hu. Fire ants self- assemble into waterproof rafts to survive floods. *Proc. of the National Academy of Sci.*, 108:7669–7673, 2011.
- [19] C. Rivault and A. Cloarec. Cockroach aggregation: Discrimination between strain odours in *Blattella germanica*. *Animal Behaviour*, 55:177–184, 1998.
- [20] M. Rubenstein, A. Cornejo, and R. Nagpal. Programmable self-assembly in a thousand-robot swarm. *Science*, 345:795–799, 2014.
- [21] L.E. Thomas. Bounds on the mass gap for finite volume stochastic Ising models at low temperature. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 126:1–11, 1989.
- [22] E. Winfree, F. Liu, L.A. Wenzler, and N.C. Seeman. Design and self-assembly of two-dimensional DNA crystals. *Nature*, 394(6693):539–544, 1998.
- [23] D. Woods, H.L. Chen, S. Goodfriend, N. Dabby, E. Winfree, and P. Yin. Active self-assembly of algorithmic shapes and patterns in polylogarithmic time. In *Proc. of the 4th Conf. on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 353–354, 2013.